

6688. By Mr. ROSSDALE: Petition of the Drug and Chemical Section of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, protesting against the enactment of the Ernst-Wood bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6689. By Mr. SWING: Petition of Pioneer Citizens of the Imperial Valley, State of California, favoring the passage of House bill 11449; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, December 28, 1922.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 27, 1922.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gerry	McCormick	Pomerene
Borah	Glass	McCumber	Sheppard
Brandagee	Hale	McKellar	Shortridge
Brookhart	Harris	McKinley	Smoot
Cameron	Harrison	McNary	Spencer
Capper	Heflin	Moses	Stanfield
Caraway	Hitchcock	Myers	Sterling
Colt	Johnson	Nelson	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	New	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Nicholson	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Norbeck	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Keyes	Norris	Warren
Dillingham	King	Oddie	Watson
Ernst	Ladd	Page	Weller
Fernald	La Follette	Pepper	Williams
Fletcher	Lenroot	Phipps	
France	Lodge	Polindexter	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily detained on account of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read a letter which I have received from the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the letter. The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, December 27, 1922.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: Replying to your inquiry relative to the proposed amendment to the pending naval bill authorizing and requesting the President to call an economic conference to deal with conditions in the war-torn nations of Europe I write to say that I know of no prohibition against such an expression on the part of the Congress, but I do frankly question the desirability of such an expression. I think it is undesirable because of the false impressions which may be conveyed thereby to Europe, and even more undesirable because of the wrong impression it conveys to our own people.

On the face of things it is equivalent to saying that the executive branch of the Government, which is charged with the conduct of foreign relations, is not fully alive to a world situation which is of deep concern to the United States. As a matter of fact, the European economic situation has been given most thorough and thoughtful consideration for many months. Without questioning the good faith of the proposal I am very sure it would have been more seemly, and the action of the Congress could be taken much more intelligently, if proper inquiry had been made of the State Department relative to the situation in which we are trying to be helpful.

Of necessity the communications of the State Department relative to delicate matters among nations can not be bulletined from day to day, but the situation is never withheld from Members of Congress who choose to inquire for confidential information in a spirit of cooperation. Such inquiry would have revealed the futility of any conference call until it is understood that such a conference would be welcomed by the nations concerned within the limits of discussion which the expressed will of Congress compels this Government to impose.

In ratifying the treaty of peace with Germany the Senate made a reservation that the United States should not be represented on the Reparations Commission without consent of Congress, and no such consent has been given. Moreover, in creating the World-War Debt Funding Commission that body was restricted to explicit terms for rates of interest and ultimate time of payment. If Congress really means to facilitate

the task of the Government in dealing with the European situation, the first practical step would be to free the hands of the commission so that helpful negotiations may be undertaken.

It is quite generally accepted that the adjustment of the question of reparations must underlie any economic rehabilitation of Europe, and reparations can not be settled without the consent of governments concerned. The United States can not assume to say to one nation what it shall pay in reparations nor to another nation what it shall accept.

In discussions with foreign governments the previous administration and the present administration have insisted that the question of European debts to the United States is distinct and apart from the question of reparations, but European nations hold a contrary view, and it is wholly inconsistent to invite a conference for the consideration of questions in dealing with which the Government is denied all authority by act of Congress.

So far as the limitation of land armaments is concerned, there seems to be at this time no more promising prospect of accomplishment than when the conference was held in Washington a year ago. Here, again I venture to warn the Senate against the suggestion to our own people or a gesture of promise to the world which can not be fulfilled until the nations directly concerned express their readiness to cooperate to such an end.

With respect to a limitation of auxiliary types of naval craft, which are not limited by the present naval treaty, it is to be said that such an agreement is much to be desired, whenever practicable, but we may reasonably postpone our further endeavors along that line until the agreements made at the Washington conference secure the final sanction of all governments concerned.

Very truly yours,

WARREN G. HARDING.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

### PETITIONS.

Mr. PHIPPS presented a resolution unanimously adopted at the member's council meeting of the Denver Civic and Commercial Association, favoring the enactment of legislation extending liberal and adequate credit facilities to farmers and stock raisers, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HALE presented a resolution adopted by the New York State Conference, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring the maintenance of a strong Navy adequate to the national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pontiac, Mich., praying that the United States protect the Armenians from persecution and massacre, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4235) granting consent of Congress to the Charlie Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across Red River between Clay County, Tex., and Cotton County, Okla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4236) granting a pension to Abner C. Hill (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 4237) to control the operation of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, to provide for indemnity bonds or insurance policies, to fix penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4238) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4239) authorizing officers who were retired for incapacity resulting from an incident of the service before July 1, 1922, to be given the same pay, according to longevity, as if retired after June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 4240) granting a pension to John R. Scott; and A bill (S. 4241) granting a pension to Fred D. Carlos; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

A bill (S. 4242) for the relief of Major V. Hampton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FRANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the so-called Borah amendment proposed to be submitted to House bill 13374, the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

In lines 2 and 3 strike out the words "such Governments as he may deem necessary or expedient," and substitute therefor the following:

"The States signatory of or adherent to the convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes of July 24, 1899, and their successors and other States since recognized."

## WOODROW WILSON'S BIRTHDAY.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, from all over the world, from the high and the low, from the rich and the poor, to-day are coming letters and cables congratulating our former President, Woodrow Wilson, on his birthday and rapid recovery of health. When every Member of this body has been forgotten, Woodrow Wilson's name will go down in history as the greatest man of this century. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution which I send to the desk may be given immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 386) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Senate has heard with great pleasure the announcement of the rapid recovery to good health of former President Hon. Woodrow Wilson: Be it

Resolved, That the Vice President be requested to express to Hon. Woodrow Wilson the pleasure and joy of the Senate of the United States because of his rapid recovery to good health.

## REPORT ON TUBERCULOSIS AMONG NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS.

Mr. SPENCER. On Friday last I presented a report on the condition of tuberculosis among the North American Indians, which was referred to the Committee on Printing. After consultation with the chairman of that committee I ask that the report be returned from that committee and be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AMERICAN RELIEF IN RUSSIA (S. DOC. NO. 277).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report by the Surgeon General of the Army showing the medicines, medical, surgical, and hospital supplies transferred to American relief organizations under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President to transfer certain medical supplies for the relief of the distressed and famine-stricken people of Russia," approved January 20, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 28, 1922.

## ADDRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Mr. CAMERON. I present an address delivered by the Attorney General at Canton, Ohio, October 21, 1922, which I think deserves to be incorporated in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

[Address by the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Harry M. Daugherty, at Canton, Ohio, October 21, 1922.]

"When law and order no longer remain as the guiding principles of all peoples and all institutions, then civilization is doomed to atavistic revolt."

"The freedom of speech guaranteed under the Constitution is not that freedom of speech which incites mob violence, destruction of life and property, and attacks on Government."

"LET US ALL SUPPORT THE GOVERNMENT THAT IS ALIKE TO ALL OF US"—JUSTICE AND EQUITY MUST BE DENIED NO CITIZEN OF THIS GREAT REPUBLIC.

(Hon. Harry M. Daugherty.)

Those charged with responsibility in the conduct of government, even though temporarily in office, should periodically be called upon and be willing to give an account of their stewardship. No politics can be practiced in the discharge of the duties of the Attorney General of the United States without interfering with the proper business of the Government and without discriminating between citizens and classes. This should never be, and it is not done in the present administration.

The people of the whole country are entitled to know accurately and honestly just what is being done in the interest of

orderly government and better society. It is impossible, of course, for public officials to disclose all the intricate moves required in the proper management of a department. As in the case of the Department of Justice, for instance, it would be disastrous to make public indiscriminately what is being done in specific instances and cases, or what is in contemplation.

## IMPORTANT MATTERS INVOLVED.

I do desire to present in a limited way—limited only because of limited time—several of the most important matters which are now engaging the attention of the Department of Justice and of your Government. All of us understand that a great Government, such as ours, can have no malice; it must be just, and it must be honest to all alike.

## STEPS TO INVESTIGATE.

I want you to keep in mind that the war ended on November 11, 1918, and from that day until the 4th of March, 1921, responsibility of conducting the vitally important legal business of the Government rested upon the previous administration. The war being over, those in positions of responsibility should immediately have begun the work of settling the affairs of the Government in order that we might forget the horrors of the conflict, ascertain who had been helpful and who had been hurtful, square the accounts, and close the books. Nothing of this character was undertaken. No suits were brought to correct mistakes and enforce adjustments.

Until this administration was installed no attempt was made to dig out the acts of dishonesty that on every hand were charged not by those in politics but by well-meaning persons, regardless of politics, who were compelled to foot the bills. Stagnation prevailed, and multitudinous claims and unadjusted accounts of every caliber and description were piled high in one conglomerate mass when the present administration came in. Barbed-wire entanglements of modern warfare were simple as compared with the artfully contrived barricades thrown up in concrete form about the countless cases of national and international importance. But no word of criticism is heard of inactivity in this respect, because such conduct suited those who have been the most critical of the Department of Justice since much has been started and much has been done.

## DUTY OF THE DEPARTMENT.

A great majority of the individuals and a great majority of the industrial concerns transacting business with the Government during the war period were honest in their representations and activities. Others, unfortunately, were not, and it was the duty of the Department of Justice as quickly as it could be done, as quietly and in as dignified a manner as it could be accomplished without sensationalism, to ascertain what transactions were honest and what dishonest; what persons grafted, if any, and who were to be placed on the golden roll of honor and beyond suspicion.

The Department of Justice, therefore, immediately began and is continuing to exercise in the interest of the Government and its people all of its great powers to see that justice may be kept alive. The war-fraud cases, under investigation by a corps of experts, representing the best legal minds obtainable within the limitations, and even far beyond the limitations because of their personal sacrifice, fixed in the appropriation for the payment of compensation, will be cleared up as rapidly as human energy can accomplish the stupendous task made so difficult through the complicated and inexcusable confusion attending all such war-time transactions.

## VOICE OF CALUMNY RAISED.

Some disloyal and incompetent employees had to be ferreted out and kicked out. The records of the war transactions had to be built up from scraps of paper and the faulty memory of witnesses in many cases scattered over the world. Those who were under suspicion and with guilty conscience had been at work for months and years to prevent the day of reckoning.

Every known method of interference and intrigue had been adopted. There was no limit to their resources. Money improperly and criminally secured in war transactions was more in amount for defense than the Government had for investigation and prosecution by civil and criminal proceedings. The scoundrels struck from behind. They hid behind willing or innocent tools, who were induced to make attacks on faithful agents and officers of the Government for the promised consideration of notoriety and spectacular and sensational temporary prominence. They had no regard for the Government; they had no regard for conscience; they had no regard for the character of any man in position, high or low, who in a painstaking way was trying to get at the truth, to protect the good name of the innocent on the one hand, and on the other trying to get dependable testimony to prove the fraud, if any, and



to find who were actually the criminals. No name was sacred, and in fact no life was safe if it stood in the way of their escape.

#### CONGRESS AID INVOKED.

As soon as we could become acquainted with the persons with whom we were to be associated, the work was begun by the regular force. Others were added as the funds at the command of the department permitted. Without sensational announcement, published notice, or vainglorious promise, the work was thus started. Up to this moment, as the directing head of the Department of Justice, I have never, in public speech or in public print, mentioned the name of a man or a concern under investigation until court proceeding was properly instituted and the records of the proceeding had served as an announcement to the entire world. It is the duty of the Department of Justice to protect as well as prosecute. The department continued to do this important work quietly as long as it was permitted to do so.

As soon as it became known how effectively the work was going on, the storm broke. When all available funds of the department had been exhausted, Congress was asked for financial assistance. It was necessary to pass laws to make it possible to bring certain suits; extra grand juries had to be provided for so that the investigations might proceed; extra judges had to be authorized in order that the courts might get at the cases expeditiously.

Legislation for this purpose was compelled to take its course, but was hurried as rapidly as possible, and the last bill necessary for the prosecution of the department's fraud work has only recently become a law. The request for the appropriation of half a million dollars for use in this particular work was made of Congress at the very time when accusation and calumny, like poison gas, were being used to prejudice, to interfere with, and to defeat the purpose of the work. Yet at the time the storm broke and reached its greatest fury sufficient facts had been quietly presented to the committees of Congress to justify the appropriation asked for, and Congress made the appropriation without a single dissenting vote in either branch, thus giving the full initial amount requested for the purpose of paying the expenses of conducting the work.

#### ENEMIES BEHIND SMOKE SCREEN.

The opposition of the crooks was conducted behind a smoke screen of calumny created for their own escape, and the real reason for the attack was in every instance withheld. The very men against whom both civil and criminal proceedings have been brought were using the ignorant and the notoriety seeker to make charges in the open that nothing was being done by the Department of Justice. The real reason for their activity was the fact that things were being done. What did any man's reputation, his character, his life even, amount to if it stood in the way of their corrupt defense? But we have gone through it all, and still we are not afraid, and we will go on.

A congressional investigation was demanded. Why? Because they could then, as they thought, disorganize us and compel us to produce the evidence prematurely, and thus dissipate the Government's efforts to bring and try the cases in a dignified, orderly way before the courts of justice of the country. They have tried for months to force an investigation and trial of these cases before congressional committees that have no judicial authority and in the daily press. This we have not done. This we will never do, no matter what the temptation and no matter what the provocation, unless under the direction of Congress as expressed by duly authorized legislation we are compelled to scatter to the four winds the facts and evidence of the Government which would enable the guilty to escape civil and criminal liability.

#### NO TURNING BACKWARD.

We are going back to the day, thank God, when there is some hope and expectation that the world and the country will be in order, and precedent well and long established will be followed for the adjudication of differences between citizen and Government. It will take time, and it will take patience. The work will be done, and it will be done as thoroughly as human agency can do it.

The Government will never answer any attack made upon the responsible heads of its departments except in the orderly process of our dependable courts. The Government will not play into the hands of those who hope to be the undeserved beneficiaries of a premature showing of the hand of the Government in transactions which it is the Government's business to investigate and rectify.

More than 400 separate and distinct cases of tremendous magnitude, representing billions of dollars, now are undergoing a process of what might be termed liquidation. Recoveries will

be made; many settlements will be made and have been made; and many transactions will be terminated successfully. I will not make promises that I do not think can be kept, and I want to say to the American people that the great unjustifiable financial loss, even considering the ravages of war, which the Government was compelled to sustain, can never be recovered, because, when the story of these contracts and transactions are truthfully written in the records of the Government, as they will be, it will be found that the greatest loss resulted from improperly made contracts wherein the interests of the Government were not properly protected, and improvident settlements too speedily made, and made without judgment, and made carelessly, recklessly, and possibly preferentially, but where actionable fraud, dishonesty, and conspiracy can not be specifically proven—all of which is necessary for conviction, and in most civil cases necessary for recovery.

#### MILLIONS SQUANDERED.

We are not picking at small things. We will only complain where complaint is justified. Many facts and disclosures attending this investigation indicate that hundreds of important contracts were entered into by the Government with great corporations and manufacturers without proper examination of conditions or requirements; without exercise of sound judgment; with carelessness and laxity that reflect no credit upon those agents of Government intrusted with authority to negotiate such contracts. Billions of dollars were squandered through this class of contracts—billions which never can be recovered.

United States attorneys throughout the country now have before them approximately 150 cases dealing with fraud in war-time transactions, and they are progressing with court action as rapidly as conditions permit. In Washington indictments already have been returned against 13 men who have been charged with complicity in attempts to defraud the Government at a time when all of our resources were so urgently needed for the prosecution of a war in which our sons by the millions were braving death in all its horror on the battle fields of Europe. Other indictments will follow in due course. It takes work and time, and several cases require more than a year and a half for preparation and investigation.

#### CAUTION IN ALL DETAILS.

I should like for the American people to know how painstakingly careful this investigation is being conducted. Attorneys who neither know, nor have now, or ever have had, any connection with those involved in the cases under investigation are endeavoring with all their skill to reach just, impartial, and scrupulously honest decisions in each individual case. When these separate cases are completed they are referred to what might be termed an advisory council, or court, which is composed of three of the most eminent legal scholars in America, who, after they have passed judgment, present their findings to the Attorney General.

Despite the infinitely careful research and analysis, the balancing of every element entering into the transactions, the sifting and sorting of facts and allegations and superficialities by trained and competent agents of Government who have spent months on their task—despite all this the Attorney General and his advisory board again go over in detail the merits of the cases before final decision is reached as to how they shall be disposed of and to see that justice is done the Government and no injustice done anybody.

In the shortest space of time in which it can be accomplished every case will be closed. Reports will be written covering every detail, omitting nothing which in the name of justice should be contained therein, and then when the Government has done its duty, whether by court proceeding or by civil settlement processes, these books and records will be sealed, this horror and scar upon our national life will be erased for all time, and it is my ambition to see terminated this tremendous task in such manner that there may be inscribed upon the back of each volume of the record and upon the title-page of each volume the words "truth and justice."

#### ORIGIN OF CRITICISM.

There has been criticism, naturally, of the Department of Justice and those who faithfully have sought to serve the Government with all the honesty of their being. I refer not only to the Attorney General himself but to those loyal and devoted officers of Government who have in silence suffered bitter and infamous charges, but whose armor, when all has been said and done, will have stood the test of faith and confidence of the people of this country.

How futile it would be for public officers to respond to every demand of the curious, to reply to subtle innuendos and criticism, to attempt to appease the curiosity of those who would



seek to learn if they or those with whom they are allied are under investigation or likely to be investigated. It is this class which indulges in criticism and attempts to throw up about every department of Government and every official in responsible position a cloud of distrust and suspicion.

We would have heard little criticism of the Department of Justice had it not been discovered that a case like the Chemical Foundation, for instance (in which valuable patents were assigned by public officials to companies which they themselves had organized), was under investigation, and the part played by those involved also was being scrutinized carefully by Government agents.

#### INSIDIOUS PROPAGANDA.

And let me here, without giving any intimation as to who the men were—let me suggest that I have had the unique experience of sitting in the Department of Justice and listening to the story of a man formerly connected with the Government and hearing patiently his pleas for certain fairly legitimate concessions, when at the same time in the city of New York another former official, one of his associates, was busily engaged in getting contributions and making connections in order that the attacks upon the Department of Justice and the Government might be increased, reinforced, and successfully continued.

I can give the names of these parties if ever they lift their voices to dispute this statement, but unless I am authorized by them so to do I should like to go through this entire investigation without prematurely mentioning names except in the orderly process of court proceedings. Their names, however, will be found in connection with certain litigation wherein some of the most important questions and some of the most questionable transactions and some of the most valuable properties in the world are in dispute, and the right and wrong of the transactions connected with the transfer of certain property must be determined in a court of justice.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT.

Now that you know the obstacles ever in the path of those officers of the Government who would do their duty honestly and faithfully, is it surprising to you that public servants so often are vilified with the most bitter and contumelious language? But as long as government lives, as long as chosen leaders of peoples perform the tasks set out for them fearlessly and with all the honesty of their being there still will be some few who would attempt to breathe scandal where no scandal lurks, to find fault where no fault exists. To attempt to combat this sort of thing would be as futile as the heroic exploits of Cyrus, who employed a whole army to revenge himself on the river Gyndas for the fright it had put him in to passing over it.

I could not in volumes give a full account of the accomplishments of the Department of Justice during this administration, but if I may, I want to give a glimpse of a few of the problems disposed of or under consideration at the present time.

During the past year civil suits to which the United States was a party were instituted to the number of 9,646; more than 8,000 were terminated. There are now pending in the courts something like 12,000 cases.

More than 60,000 criminal prosecutions were begun. During the year 53,000 were terminated. There are now pending more than 64,000 cases.

From these prosecutions and adjudication of cases brought under the present administration, nearly four and a half million dollars were realized by the Government from the civil suits alone, while fines and penalties to the amount of three and a half million dollars were realized, making a total of nearly eight million dollars.

#### COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION.

The total appropriation allotted for the conduct of the Department of Justice for 1922 was \$19,000,000. How trivial this sum would seem when it is remembered that in 1913, for instance, the enormous sum of \$11,000,000 was appropriated for the department when the problems were infinitesimal as compared with the issues of towering magnitude to-day. It must be understood that the Department of Justice is now cleaning up the war debris and the department has at least ten times as much work and business as it ever had before.

Another administration accomplishment, one which is most gratifying, was the enactment of legislation which made possible additional judgeships. Our courts are clogged, but now, with 24 additional trial judges, the Nation may look forward to the expediting of cases which long since should have been disposed of. On June 30 of this year there were in excess of 172,000 civil and criminal cases pending in the Federal courts of the United States.

The American people must be protected by its courts. One particular issue which it shall be my privilege to force will be the disposal of approximately 480 cases developed through postal frauds and which are now pending. These cases, now in the hands of United States attorneys for institution of criminal proceedings, represent the filching from the public—widows, old men, and even children—of the enormous sum of \$140,000,000. These scheming and vulturous users of the United States mails shall be brought to trial, and the humble citizens victimized shall have the satisfaction of knowing that the Government is determined to see that their cases get as much attention as the cases in which the great and mighty are involved. Equity and justice must be denied no citizen of this country, now or hereafter, if our courts and our public officers are to enjoy the continued confidence of the people.

#### NO APOLOGIES TO OFFER.

From the birth of this Republic to the present day the American Government has never shirked its duty to nor felt constrained to apologize for any action or step taken in the interest of its nationals and its industries. Nor shall the Attorney General of the United States now or hereafter apologize for any act of his which provides protection and establishes more firmly those bulwarks of human liberty and justice to which the American people are so bountifully entitled.

No more sacred trust is placed upon Government or man than that which looks to the preservation of the traditions and ideals of enlightened civilization. And when basic fundamentals of our national welfare are threatened, when conniving and vicious elements seek through menacing doctrines and destructive acts to undermine the faith of the people in their Government and those officials who have been chosen by mandate to guide and guard with all the honesty and fearlessness of human courage the laws of God and man, then I say that the time has come when eternal vigilance not only becomes a precaution but a duty on the part of mankind.

If American institutions are to endure they must be surrounded and buttressed by all the protective forces known to the ingenuity of man.

#### LABOR AND THE GOVERNMENT.

I am not now, nor have I ever been, an opponent of honestly conceived labor organizations and trade-unionism. If I were a skilled worker in mill, factory, or mine I would join a union, but I would never affiliate with a union that sets its laws and its constitution above the laws and Constitution of my country. In a great industrial nation, such as ours, labor organizations are necessary, but they must be the right kind of unions under the right kind of leadership.

Labor must be constructive and not destructive. There must be loyalty to employer, to the Nation. The radical and unscrupulous leader and those elements which make up the agitator type must be eliminated from our national life. They menace the whole system of trade-unionism, and for its own protection organized labor must banish them from its ranks. The advocate of violence in our national and industrial life must go, and the word of labor everywhere must be as good as its bond.

If those who come to this country and become naturalized citizens, that they may enjoy the benefits the country affords to all alike, are not satisfied with our laws and our form of government, then they should as rapidly as possible denaturalize themselves and return to the country under whose laws they did not care to live but whose theories they would attempt to exploit upon us.

#### THE CHICAGO INJUNCTION.

I am not altogether sure but that we have reached the point where for the safety of the country every foreigner coming to our shores should be met at the dock and impressed with the fact that he must, before naturalization, in some effective manner prove his worthiness to citizenship in this great Republic. As it is too many of those entering our gates are met at the port by the professional parasite and advised that the only prerequisite to American citizenship is membership in this or that organization—organizations which are dedicated to the destruction of the very freedom which the immigrant hopes to enjoy.

One of the most important steps taken by the Department of Justice in the interest of the American people was that in connection with the injunction proceedings at Chicago that re-established justice and individual rights in America. The railroads of the country are compelled by law to furnish interstate commerce for the country. It is the duty of Government to see that this obligation is performed according to the letter of the law. The roads were attempting to keep interstate com-



merce alive, but conditions had reached a point where this was made impossible through lack of skilled workers, deterioration of equipment, and other conditions brought about by the strike of 400,000 members of the Federated Shop Crafts Unions.

The Government acted. It was a duty, not to labor, not to the railroads, but to the American people and to the Government itself. More than 17,000 affidavits from every section of the United States concerning anarchy bordering on civil war furnished convincing proof that the people needed the protection of their Government as never before.

Bear in mind that I did not undertake this proceeding as a partisan or as the advocate of the railroads. As between the railroads and those with whom they were in conflict, considering the matters in dispute, I was neutral, and I took no action on behalf of the Government until it became apparent to the entire country that interstate commerce and the carrying of the mails were being interfered with to the extent that our people and our industries were being materially affected. In fact, more than 1,000 mail trains had been withdrawn from service.

#### ECONOMY IN EXPENDITURES.

Was the Government interested? The Department of Justice alone spent probably a million and a half dollars in seven weeks, as economically as it could be used, to keep down strife and preserve order in its neutral capacity between the contesting parties.

In the last half of August it was evident to all that the situation was growing worse, and it was solely in the interest of the entire people, the maintenance of commerce, and the carrying of the mails, furnishing food and fuel, that the Government performed its duty when it brought action to restrain those who were interfering with transportation and threatening the life of the Government. It may truly be said that the transportation crisis through which we passed came dangerously near imposing a veto upon the economic readjustment of our national life.

When the heads of the Federated Shop Crafts unions called their strike the men who walked out were in revolt against a 12 per cent reduction in wages authorized by the Railroad Labor Board, the quasi judicial body charged by Federal law with the duty of fixing railway wages. This move was a complete renunciation of the Esch-Cummins law, which afforded them special protection as to wage status by providing that all disputes concerning basic wage conditions and working rules should be referred to a Federal tribunal representing the roads, workers, and the public.

#### FAIR WAGE FOR LABOR.

Thus, with one bold challenge to constitutional government, the strike leaders to all apparent purposes renounced the protection of governmental authority when they mutinied against a decision which they construed to be unfavorable to their cause.

In practically every other industry in this country and throughout the world war wage scales had been abandoned, but union leaders demanded continuation of wage inflation at the war peak.

The Government and those chosen to safeguard its integrity and constitutional rights believe that labor deserves and should enjoy an equitable wage scale. On this issue there is no quarrel between labor and government.

More than 40,000,000 wage earners in this country depend upon organized government for livelihood, and protection of their interest ever constitutes a source of deep concern to government. In the industries alone some 30,000,000 toil in mill, factory, on public carriers, and in the mines. Of this number organized labor claims a representation of five or six million.

When certain rail workers were instructed by their leaders to lay down their tools, 400,000 of the 1,600,000 men employed by the carriers walked out in defiance of the law. A certain conspicuous union leader immediately suggested that a sympathetic or progressive strike was being considered, which would involve other crafts which had remained loyal to the carriers themselves and to their country. Attempts were made by strike leaders at this juncture to justify their stand by subtle intimation to workers that further wage reductions were contemplated by the Railroad Labor Board. But fundamentally the revolt was against the 12 per cent wage reduction.

Neither Punic cunning nor the vociferous canting of those who had determined to crush any conciliatory spirit that might exist among the army of wage earners thus arbitrarily ordered into idleness could disguise the facts behind this revolt against government.

#### RULINGS OF THE LABOR BOARD.

Not a year back this same governmental board whose ruling now was branded as an "infamous injustice to American workmen" had, in its decision No. 2, directed a substantial increase

in the wages of rail employees. The carriers submitted, though they complained that labor costs had increased 115 per cent in comparison with 54 per cent increase in revenues made possible through higher rates granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

From a period of distressing inflation and soaring prices the country had passed into a period of severe liquidation; and the Labor Board, in effect, through its ruling No. 1036, of June 5 this year, had decreed that, in view of reduced wages in other industries, railway wages must of necessity be made to approximate them if readjustment of our economic and industrial life was to be accomplished.

But the die was cast, and labor's legions marched in solid phalanx from beneath the protecting bulwarks of constitutional law at the command of their leaders.

Industrial paralysis, human suffering, and irretrievable losses confronted the Nation as train after train was laid off. Cessation of traffic was destroying the arteries of trade and commerce. Government, industry, society, and labor itself realized that the helpless millions jammed into the great centers of population were dependent upon transportation for food—for life itself. But the upheaval went on. Sporadically tales came out of the West, the Southwest, and the South and from our northern border States of derailments, maiming, sabotage, and even murder.

#### FACED BY AN ECONOMIC CRISIS.

Just a year back more than five million men and women were walking the streets of our cities, jobless, hungry, and despondent; but now they were at work, through the sound operation of constructive government. The coal strike, which had spread over five months, was nearing final settlement, and 600,000 miners and their families were about to return to work contented. But anew there blazed upon the horizon of a prosperous Government and a happy people a crisis which stunned the Nation—a crisis which threatened not only economic and industrial depression, not only a recurrence of idleness among our wage earners, but the country's transportation systems, upon which all elements alike must depend for orderly government and those things which must hold together the human fabric.

Out of Philadelphia came the mandate of one of the heads of the shop crafts in that district, and which appeared to reflect the attitude of other leaders, that—

We will tie up every train, both freight and passenger; every ferryboat and every railway shop, and not a wheel will turn anywhere.

Government was being mocked and pilloried in scorn. Appeals were being made to Washington by countless thousands of American citizens. Scarcely a community in any part of this broad, free land was being spared the iron heel of terrorism. Depredation of property was in full swing and human life was anything but sacred. All the great transcontinental systems were jeopardized, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, after infinitely painstaking surveys, had found that the rolling stock and equipment of the afflicted roads were so seriously impaired that 50 per cent of the locomotives in use were unfit for service and many were out of commission entirely.

The Nation was in the grip of civil war. We had reached a point where loyal, intelligent Americans wondered if organized government actually existed in this free land of ours—or a land presumed to be free and consecrated to observance of law. Criminals of the vilest types, apostles of the ultra-red variety, and crafty, power-lusting missionaries of discord mingled in the attack upon life, property, law, and government.

#### FIRM STEP NECESSARY.

Then, when all conciliatory efforts on the part of trusted Government emissaries had failed, when court proceedings in practically every district in the United States had been instituted by the railroads to safeguard their property and prevent willful and malicious interference with the orderly operation of their lines, when men were willing and anxious to work if permitted to do so, when the heads of the strikers had called upon the men who had deserted their tools and shops at their dictation to do "their damndest and then some," when human suffering and hardships were beginning to leave their impress upon the innocent and helpless public, when transportation was impaired 50 per cent or more, and the country was stung to a fury, the time had arrived when national security no longer made it possible for government to stay its hand. A decisive and firm step was essential to the preservation of American institutions, its people, and the basic principles of government itself.



## MORAL SUASION INEFFECTIVE.

Moral suasion up to this point had fallen upon deaf ears. Finally both railroad executives and shopcraft heads appealed to President Harding to use his good offices in an effort to adjudicate the differences between the two elements. In the most patient and painstaking way the President's great genius as a human harmonizer was put forth, but by the latter part of August his efforts had failed to receive the consideration to which they so rightfully were entitled. The President appealed to the striking workers, without denying their right to strike, though I may say on my own behalf, considering the fact they had submitted their dispute to the Railroad Labor Board, they had no moral right, at least, to repudiate that arm of the Government by refusing to abide by its decision. Appeal to the railroad executives received no remedial response. Reconciliation appeared to be impossible between the conflicting hosts, though the Government and its highest officers had expended every ounce of energy and brain force to persuade opposing leaders to compose their differences.

Railroad tracks and terminal shops of the country were in control of men who were undertaking to prevent other workers performing duties necessary to the free flow of interstate commerce. Demagogic and violently bitter disciples of force and anarchy worked in open sympathy with those who would paralyze transportation and stultify government, for no industrial dispute of mammoth scale in this country can survive without the contribution of this criminal class which revels in vandalism and thrives off the bounty of strike managers, who, perhaps oftentimes innocently, are inveigled into accepting their support.

## IMMEDIATE ACTION DEMANDED.

Could government therefore be expected to remain supinely indifferent when its authority was challenged and threatened by chaos as deadly as armed strife itself? I say no, and every thinking man with love for his country and his fellow man will say no as vehemently as I do.

When government falters, when its chosen leaders neither know nor respect their duty, when law and order no longer remain as the guiding principles of all peoples and all institutions, then civilization is doomed to atavistic revolt. Thus fell Rome and Athens, and thus passed the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, but America was neither to succumb nor surrender to those elements which sought to destroy the traditions and ideals upon which her forefathers had builded a Nation of justice to all mankind.

What was the Government to do? The only logical answer and the only effective measure possible was an appeal to the courts for a restraining order—restraining those responsible for this condition of affairs from further interference with interstate commerce.

Before discussing the features of and the intent of an injunction let me say that the injunction proceedings at Chicago were instituted under the provisions of the Sherman law, the same law which 28 years ago was invoked by President Cleveland in the so-called Debs strike, when Federal troops were marched into Chicago by the thousands, and the same law employed by my predecessor during President Wilson's administration in a controversy wherein coal miners and operators were involved at Indianapolis. Cleveland, it will be remembered, was denounced as a despot and tyrant by sniping demagogues who scorned our Constitution and laws. But this was Cleveland's greatest public service.

## THE SHERMAN ACT.

Section 1 of the Sherman Act declares that—

"Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

Section 4 declares:

"The several circuit courts of the United States are hereby invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of this act; and it shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violations. Such proceedings may be by way of petition setting forth the case and praying that such violations shall be enjoined or otherwise prohibited. When the parties complained of shall have been duly notified of such petition the court shall proceed, as soon as may be, to the hearing and determination of the case; and pending

such petition and before final decree the court may at any time make such temporary restraining order or prohibition as shall be deemed just in the premises."

## COMPARED WITH CLAYTON ACT.

The Clayton Act contains a similar provision, but the Clayton Act does not modify the Sherman Act in a situation of this character where the Government itself is a complainant and where interstate commerce is involved.

A temporary restraining order or injunction, "such as was properly and legally granted in the recent case, probably would not be authorized in a similar contest between employer and employee or in strikes in industrial enterprises upon which the Government does not depend to aid it in maintaining interstate commerce and the transportation of the mails.

What is an injunction? Radicals and other obsequious sycophants, supported by that infinitely small portion of the press which depends for its circulation upon sensation and socialism, would have us believe that it is a modern device, a recent discovery. The injunction is the most humane, the most charitable, and the most prompt and effective civil proceeding known to law. Violation of an injunction may be punished by the court issuing the injunction, but the violator has a right to stand before the court, assert his right, defend his act, and be judged guilty or guiltless, as the court may determine. When a set of men are unwilling to abide by the decision of the court, they should be forced to do so, and when they no longer can be forced to stand before the bar of justice, then government ceases to exist.

## INJUNCTION AS A REMEDY.

Further, an injunction is the laying of the hand of the Government in an admonishing and restraining way upon the shoulder of a man who is about to commit a crime, warning him and ordering him to stay his hand and hold his wrath and desist from committing a crime and becoming a criminal. If he stops, no crime is committed. If there is a dispute as to his right, he is given a speedy hearing before the court, which answers finally the question of right and wrong, justice and injustice.

The injunction is a remedy that has in one form or another existed throughout the entire period of civilization. It is as old as the common law itself, and held an important place in the protection of legal rights under the Roman law. Self-help, or the impulse to take the law into one's own hands, which the history of civilization shows to degenerate into mob violence if left unrestrained, is the alternate course of conduct which all through history has run parallel to the efforts of organized society to protect rights and redress wrongs by a government of law and order.

Even under governments firmly established the primal impulse asserts itself at times to take the law into one's own hands. Hence the functions of courts have been not only to redress wrongs already committed but to protect rights, and by writs of injunction forbid a threatened course of conduct in advance of the actual invasion of the right. The injunction is fundamental in every system of jurisprudence worthy of the name that has been devised for the protection of human rights. A fundamental principle of English law is that "Where there is a right, there is a remedy." Running along with the legal maxim is another old adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," and the common-law system found the writ of injunction effective for accomplishing its purpose.

## PROTECTION FROM CRIME.

The injunction further saves a man from becoming a criminal. It protects the rights, not only of government itself but of all the people pending final judicial adjudication. It was the mildest form of procedure that could have been adopted in this case.

If the injunction were not resorted to, what was the next thing the Government could do after all efforts at voluntary and peaceful persuasion had failed? Step aside and let violence continue; let the mob grow in fury and in numbers; let the leaders with torch and bomb and dagger continue destruction of life and property? Could the Government permit itself to be weakened to a point where, after commission of hideous crimes by unrestrained hordes of violators of all we hold sacred, it would find itself impotent to adopt the policy it did?

Is it not better to prevent a man from committing a crime than to encourage him to become a criminal? Is it not better to restrain him by the gentle hand of the law in a kindly but impressive way than to let him go along to his own destruction? Is it not better to have men again at work, as they now are, than confined in jails, as many of them would be had this injunction not been issued?



Another step the Government could have taken was to have called out Federal troops. That would have been a sorry day, but it would have been done had necessity compelled. Appeal after appeal had come to Washington for troops, but armed troops were withheld. Who will say that it is not better to lay the hand of Government, with its restraint, its admonition, and protection, on the shoulder of the citizen than to call out troops to shoot him down, and, as is always the case, mingle his blood with the blood of innocent bystanders and bruise the hearts of his loved ones?

#### RIGHTS OF THE MINORITY.

In such a situation, if none of the steps referred to were taken, then Government would cease to exist in name as well as in fact; the people would become the prey of human vultures, anarchy would permeate the land, and mob rule would become the law.

We hear quite a little about the rights of the minority. A minority in this country has greater rights and is protected to a greater extent than in any other country in the world. But a minority has no right to deny to the majority the right it claims for itself. The minority has no right to promote civil war, impoverish a nation, deprive a people of those things to which they are entitled under the law, or to ignore and seek to withhold from the majority rights as equal as those enjoyed by the minority.

I hear no great cry on the part of the Nation's "mentors" as to the rights of the majority. It would seem from observation that there is a broad impression on the part of the doctrinaire and their ill-advised and sycophantic followers that the majority is subservient to the will of the minority, and the minority is subservient to the will of the radical, and that the radical may be led by any person who comes to our shores and undertakes to lead the American people into a pathway of fire and flame and chaos, intimidation, coercion, and disloyalty.

#### NO VOICE AGAINST CRIMES.

When the Chicago injunction was granted there was a hue and cry on the part of this radical element that the freedom of speech was being interfered with. It has been my privilege to read and hear, since the granting of the restraining order, great volumes of criticism, unfounded, of course, which in itself would seem to indicate sufficient proof that the freedom of speech neither has been interfered with nor abridged in any respect.

It must be remembered that the freedom of speech guaranteed under the Constitution is not that freedom of speech which incites mob violence, destruction of life and property, and attacks on Government. That is not what our forefathers intended by vouchsafing freedom of speech and liberty of press.

May I call the attention of the law-respecting citizens of this country to the fact that no frenzied voice was lifted by these same pedagogic pawns of profligacy when law-abiding American citizens by the hundreds, all over the land, were dragged into the mire of the woods, stripped of their clothing, and there left; when almost as many, according to prearranged schedule, well carried out, it seems, by somebody, were tarred and feathered, when others were thrown into streams and their clothing destroyed.

Where, it might be asked, were those frenzied voices now crying out for freedom of speech and liberty of press, when the loyal engineer and his crew, in the dead of night, faithful to their service and their country, pulled 12 Pullman cars across the continent only to be suddenly switched into eternity without a moment's notice by the vandal and murderer who pulled the spikes and threw the switches that murder might contribute to the cause of anarchy, and anarchy might destroy government?

#### FACED CRITICAL PERIOD.

Where were these frenzied voices when train after train, loaded with men, women, and children, were ruthlessly and criminally abandoned by those in charge as a part of a conspiracy, and left in the hot sands of the Santa Fe, with food and water scarce, comforts few, fright surrounding, even birth taking place—left to the tender mercies of Providence and the Government of the United States, if those responsible for the conspiracy were not successful in destroying it?

Where were these frenzied voices when \$100,000,000 worth of produce raised in the State of California alone was left to rot because the railroads were not permitted to transport it to the consumer because of a quarrel between a small percentage of the citizenship of the United States?

Where were these frenzied voices when that horrible thing occurred at Herron, Ill., that will forever be a blot upon the community and the Nation?

We had reached the time when, if necessary, people of this country, in order to protect their homes, perpetuate their liberty, and be guaranteed the right to work and earn and save, were about to be called upon to write in human blood a new Declaration of Independence and a new declaration of human rights and liberty.

#### THE RIGHT TO STRIKE.

Men have the right to strike; surely this proceeding does not destroy that. Men have the right to work; surely this proceeding insures that. There is no involuntary servitude in this country, but slavery consists as much in depriving a man of the right to work as in compelling him to work against his will.

The fact of the matter is that, under the circumstances and evidence existing and proved in the case at Chicago, had the Attorney General not complied with the provisions of the law by taking the action he did, he could have been impeached, and any Attorney General failing or refusing under similar circumstances to do precisely what was done should be impeached.

There will be no backward step in the policy of the Government as at present organized. I know that unless legislation prevents, if established policies prevail, if the courts are not destroyed, if duty is performed by those in positions of authority, all will be treated fairly in this country—labor and capital alike. I think we have reached the day when it may truthfully be said that we have seen in the United States the last extensive strike involving the tying up of transportation.

In conclusion I want to say another word here to labor. As truthful a statement as any I have made in this address I now make: I am your sincere friend and will not deceive you, but you make a mistake when you set up rules in conflict with the rules, laws, and Constitution of our common country, which rules and laws and Constitution are applicable to every other man in every other employment, and must, for your own security and safety, be applicable to you.

#### SECURITY IN THE CONSTITUTION.

Your principal trouble lies, and your greatest danger is, in the radicalism and character of some of your most prominent leaders. Your security lies in the Constitution of the United States and in the laws of the United States and in the good opinion, by you deserved, of all the American people. There should be no quarrel between labor and the Government.

A few irreconcilable railroad executives, who insist upon calling themselves "hard boiled," might also, with considerable benefit to the country, be dispensed with. The fault is not all on one side, but at a time when strife that was almost civil war raged in this country the Government, having the right to do so, insisted upon the railroads performing their necessary functions to serve the people. Those in conflict with the railroads interfered with the performance of this service, and it was to protect the rights of all the people, strikers and employers, and every man, woman, and child in the country, that the Government in its rightful capacity took a hand.

#### FULL RESPONSIBILITY ACCEPTED.

I accept my full responsibility for the step taken, and though it temporarily shocked because of the sudden halt of civil war, I would under the same circumstances do the same thing again or feel incapable to speak for an important branch of the Government and unworthy of the confidence and trust imposed in me by the President of the United States.

Let us all love and support the Government that is alike to all of us. The picture is not all dark. The country is secure, the Government is dependable, the rights of the people are safe. The best proof of that fact was when a dignified court, exercising jurisdiction with courage and fairness, issued a restraining order to prevent the destruction of government, the taking of life, and the sacrifice of property. All turned to the warning, and peace and quiet and thought and judgment again reigned, and when I saw that and when you saw that, well might we say, in the words of another great Ohio President, "God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives."

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire briefly to discuss the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to the bill which is now before the Senate. In view of the brevity of the remarks which I shall make, I hope that no Member of the Senate will ask me to yield for the purpose of a question.



Mr. President, the man in the street would say, if two or more were in disagreement, the chances are that a mutual understanding would be reached if the discordant persons placed their feet under the same table and discussed the various factors that brought about such disagreement.

By applying the same formula, discord subsisting among the nations would likely disappear by assembling an economic conference where world-wide welfare could be discussed and the nations participating made to understand their mutual dependency and that national prosperity is founded upon mutual sympathy and helpfulness.

In my humble opinion, the amendment offered by the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is limited to operate only in the field of international economics and can not be construed to imply any obligation calculated to involve any aggressive or defensive military action, or to entangle this Nation in any political maelstrom. The only charge laid upon the conference is the duty of considering the economic problems now confronting the world, followed by the expression of a hope that some understanding or arrangement may be reached providing for the restoration of trade and the establishment of the finances of the world on a solid foundation.

I know of no provision of the Constitution that would permit the delegates at a conference of this character to obligate our country in respect to a reduction or cancellation of the allied debt, or to consider any other subject concerning our relations with foreign powers that are properly the subject of negotiations by the President and ratification or rejection by the Senate. Mr. President, I am not disturbed nor made to tremble by the rumblings of the isolationists that at an economic conference the traditional policies of our country would be overthrown or disregarded; nor am I persuaded by the argument that the best policy for this country to pursue is to leave the nations of Europe alone until they solve their own problems which so greatly concern us. That effort has been going on in Europe for more than two years, while this country has sat supinely by and conditions have grown steadily worse, until at this time it appears as though the whole economic edifice of Europe is tottering to its fall. The nations engaged in the last war have drifted widely and strangely apart until they are now on the brink of chaos, and unless heroic measures are undertaken by them, with the powerful assistance of this country, financial collapse to many will follow, and to others instability and internal turmoil will be gathered as the harvest of dissension.

Mr. President, I can see no analogy between the commitments contained in the covenant of the League of Nations and the mere effort to discover the proper economic action the various nations should take in the present world crisis under the suggestion of the Borah amendment. The plan proposed does not anticipate the employment of a soulless economic boycott or retaliation as a means of its enforcement, nor does it suggest in the mildest way the use of armed force in any form. It is fashioned to fit the present unstable conditions running riot throughout the world and to clear the economic current of the world from the debris of hate and discord which are keeping open the wounds of war. This Nation, powerful and rich, should take as much interest and display as much concern to bring about mutual accord among its debtor nations as does the private banker manifest in the welfare of those patrons who have created pecuniary obligations in the institution of which he is the directing head. Aloofness should be our national policy when powerful foreign forces operate to involve us to our peril or national disadvantage, but such a situation can not grow out of a mere economic conference unless it is the desire of the people of this great Republic, expressed through their Representatives in the Congress. Therefore I cherish no fear that my country will shift from its assured foundation on account of any economic discussion in which it may choose to participate.

Mr. President, in a large way the cruel and unfortunate plight of the farmer is due to the fact that he is smothering in a surplus of agricultural products. A strong, brisk, foreign market, such as he is entitled to enjoy, would lift the farmer from impending ruin to a position where he could meet his obligations and leave him a fair profit for his laborious work and his investment. To this reward he is abundantly entitled. After a study of the problems of rural credits by the Members of the Congress representing agricultural States, legislation designed to provide farm credits so that the farmers may obtain better prices through the orderly marketing of their products will soon be brought before either branch of Congress for consideration. This legislation has been long delayed, but is now upon us and should be speedily enacted into law. But what is most needed by our farming population are markets, and these can be found and will be supplied if Europe is at

rest, stabilized, and its economic structure made safe and sound. It will be said that rural products have moved to various nations in considerable abundance. This statement I shall accept as a verity. Owing to improved methods of farming and labor-saving machinery, farm production is greater than formerly, and in consequence thereof a greater quantity is available for exportation and must be exported to permit the residue to demand and receive a fair and profitable price. The surplus would be absorbed by other countries if proper credits—national, corporate, or otherwise—could be arranged. I do not advocate loaning more money to our creditor nations, but I do stoutly believe that if the reparations which Germany owes were reduced to a point where she can pay, thereby restoring the morale of her people, private capital would flow to Europe in such a volume as speedily to bring about a correction of the present unfortunate economic conditions existing in Germany and in other European nations. I am not predicting that any outstanding achievements would follow as a result of the proposed conference, but, in any event, its efforts would discover the true situation, which in itself might be of great value in future treatment of conditions in Europe.

In an ably edited paper, the Oregonian, there appeared an editorial about a week ago from which I quote the following:

So grave is the plight of Great Britain, France, and Germany that a positive move by one of them that was deemed harmful to it by either or both of the others might light a flame of war that would soon become a conflagration enveloping the Old World. If a French army should advance into Germany, not only might it meet armed resistance but it might easily start a war that would spread eastward. Allied with Germany is Russia, and allied with Russia is Turkey. These three are the making of a new triple alliance, hungry, destitute of all but arms and fighting capacity, but in the mood to defy a world that is utterly weary of war. If Britain and Italy should stand aside, these desperadoes might defy France and might strike to regain all that they have lost and to take much more. Such a war would sweep over Poland, the Danubian States, and the Balkans, and could not fail to involve Britain and Italy.

It is doubtful whether the United States could keep out. If we should, it would be at the sacrifice of civilization in Europe. Though that might not move our isolationists, the loss of the market for three-fourths of our exports would. At the best, Germany would sullenly submit to armed occupation, and France would probably collect from a nation that having lost hope had abandoned itself to bankruptcy, no more than would pay the cost of the army, while all Europe would continue to slide down the slope of moral and material decay, more slowly though no less surely than if hastened by war.

Mr. President, I make no claim to knowledge of international affairs. My activities while a member of this body have been confined to domestic issues, particularly with reference to agricultural undertakings; but I have held to the belief that after the termination of the world-wide war our policy of isolation has been too severe for the good of ourselves and the welfare of the world. I know full well that this belief will arouse the opposition of the international statesmen's bloc, found among the intellectuals of the United States Senate. I have no doubt that the great majority of the farmers and laborers and business men of the country will look with favor upon any plan constructed to bring about the economic rehabilitation of world affairs.

Mr. President, I shall never know whether it was the stubbornness of our distinguished President, Woodrow Wilson, the perversity of the able senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], or the eloquence of the irreconcilable Senators that prevented the ratification of the Versailles treaty, yet I shall always think that much of the unrest and hatred existing among the nations at this time would not have occurred if that treaty containing the covenant of the League of Nations, with the Lodge reservations, had been ratified.

Having that view, I can not persuade myself to oppose any conference which I believe would work for a better understanding among the nations of the world, even though such a conference calls upon this Government to play an important rôle. The result of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament, held in this city 13 months ago, aroused the antagonism of many learned and patriotic statesmen in this country, still I venture the prophecy that the labors of this conference will prove beneficial beyond the expectations of its most ardent advocates; and so I express the confident belief that an economic conference held in Washington, attended by representatives of various war-shocked nations, would result in the world stabilization of currency, exchange, and flow of commerce equal to the calculations of those devoted to the restoration of agricultural and other industries to a profitable basis.

America is not going back to Europe, for Europe will come to America for the healing of her wounds, to compose her differences, and to direct her to a haven of peace and economic achievement. Sincerely believing in the wisdom of the policy and having faith in its possible benefit to mankind, I shall actively support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to the pending naval appropriation bill.



Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, there are many of us who followed yesterday's debate and the argument of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] this morning with unflagging attention, in the hope, in the expectation, that we might find weighty argument upon the necessity of adopting the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I say "weighty argument upon the necessity of adopting the amendment," for I assume that Senators do not seek to impose upon the President a moral obligation to summon a conference under the broad terms of the amendment unless they believe either that he is uninformed as to the condition of Europe or, if he is informed, that he is incapable of acting or is unwilling to act upon that information.

It is not difficult for Senators to enjoin a President to convoke a conference upon an international question like that of the economic distress of Europe. It is a very different matter to conduct the delicate negotiations both precedent to a conference and necessary to its successful conclusion. Certainly there arise from time to time international difficulties which can be surmounted only by international conference. There befall a suffering world ills so general that only international action will cure them. Such was the case when the continued burden of armament and the threatened competition in the building of battle fleets led to the summoning of the Washington conference.

The conference—as the Senator from Idaho, I think, indicated yesterday—was not called as the result of any action of Congress upon the question. Even before the President had been inaugurated, within 60 days of the election of 1920, informal communications passed between the President elect and European statesmen then charged with the responsibility for government looking to the limitation of armament and the resolution of the then existing differences between the naval powers.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. McCORMICK. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I am quite willing to concede the construction put upon history by the Senator from Illinois as to the fact that the President had months before conceived of this movement, but under that condition of affairs what becomes of the construction which was placed upon the statute yesterday that the President can not call a conference without the authority of Congress?

Mr. McCORMICK. If I remember, in the debate yesterday the Senator from Idaho said that the statute would not stand.

Mr. BORAH. I said I doubted that it would stand the test; but does the Senator understand that the President did disregard that statute wholly when he called the conference?

Mr. McCORMICK. Oh, Mr. President, since the Congress had acted prior to the calling of the conference, patently he did not disregard the statute.

Mr. BORAH. That is the answer which the Senator desires to make?

Mr. McCORMICK. It seems to me a perfectly obvious statement of the sequence of events. The negotiations—I said the negotiations—were precedent to any action by Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Then, as a matter of fact, unless the resolution had been passed, the President could not have called the conference without violating the statute?

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, if the negotiations had reached a successful conclusion, and if it were necessary to secure legislative action, the President could have sought it.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely; but that is not the question which I submit. Unless the resolution had been passed, the President could not have called the conference without violating the statute?

Mr. McCORMICK. If the Senator will permit me, I think that is beside the mark.

Mr. BORAH. It seems so.

Mr. McCORMICK. It was made to appear at one time in the naval debate two years ago that action by Congress was necessary to initiate the calling of the conference.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCORMICK. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. May I ask the Senator from Idaho whether a statute could not be valid limiting the power of the President to call certain kinds of conferences without its applying to conferences which are clearly within the Presidential power?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the statute unfortunately makes no distinction as to the kind of conference.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand that.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, in this connection let me add that I am not sure, as I look back upon the sequence of events, that the initial action by Congress did not handicap the American negotiators at the Washington conference. The ef-

forts in yonder Chamber and here drastically to curtail the power of the American Navy, and eagerly to press upon the Executive the obligation to negotiate with governments financially weaker than our own, gave evidence to foreign statesmen that there were certain molders of opinion in this country, as eloquent as they were influential, who were not unready to disarm America even though the world remained armed. I have thought that the congressional agitation at that time weakened our position and made necessary the negotiation of the four-power treaty, for which some Senators would not vote, and for which others like myself could not have voted but for the Brandegee reservation.

The history of the ratification of those treaties has been interesting.

The powers which were financially able to support the burden of naval armament were the first to ratify. The other signatories of the five-power treaty, with vast and constantly growing debts, with recurring and disastrous deficits, have not yet ratified the naval treaty. In my humble opinion, France would not have made ready to ratify after the new year but for the foresight, the prudence, and the influence of Charles de Chambrun, who has returned to Paris after his service as minister ad interim in Washington. The French Government first, and the Italian Government later, doubtless will ratify the restricted treaty for the limitation of naval armaments, while all the while France has refused to consider the limitation of aircraft, subsurface craft, or light cruisers and destroyers. She would not thus limit her sea power and would not limit her land forces at all, although to deny that Germany is utterly disarmed is so wide of the facts as to be ludicrous.

The powers of continental Europe have done what their past bade them do, not what the present demanded of them. They have sought to subordinate economic actualities to political considerations. It was in the dim light of the past that Europe wrote the four obscurantist treaties—one of which the Turks have rewritten in the blood of dying Christians and another of which the victorious allies have revised in the tears of the starving Austrians.

The present state of Europe, so depressed as to touch our prosperity, after all is due to no single cause, economic or political. Plainly it is attributable in great part to the waste of war, which can be made good only by years of toil and frugal living on the part of millions; it is attributable in part to the ruin of Russia, where more millions have died since the Imperial and Bolshevik peace of Brest-Litovsk than ever were killed while Russia fought Germany; it is attributable in part to the Balkanization of Europe by the peace treaties, which some would have had ratified by the Senate which added new boundaries, new governments, new armies, new customs, borders, new traffic tariffs to the many which threatened peace and thwarted trade in Europe before the war; it is attributable in part to the ambitious and aborted policies of short-lived cabinets throughout Europe; to the planless purposes of inexperienced parliaments seeking to govern talented and dauntless peoples long denied self-government.

There is no convention of the powers under the covenant of the league proposed to the Senate by Woodrow Wilson, or under the general conference proposed to the Senate by the Senator from Idaho, which can recreate in a year that which was destroyed by the war through the long years which, by recognition of the soviet, by loans, or gifts to the soviet, can rebuild the vastest ruin in history which the soviets have wrought. Neither President Wilson's league, which lives and languishes, nor the Senator's conference, which is not yet born, can break down the new political and economic barriers set up by the treaties of peace and guaranteed by the league; neither of them can endow newly freed peoples with an age-old experience in self-government, in political self-denial, in political prudence and political self-restraint, in political administrative efficiency. How long did the newly freed American Colonies suffer under the Articles of Confederation before they devised and accepted the Constitution of the United States?

The world seeks a remedy for its ills. Remedy by the league? Remedy by conference?

The members of the league have met in conference in Geneva. The governments of Europe met in conference at Genoa. The prime ministers have met in conference, political and economic, at San Remo, Cannes, Paris, Spa, Brussels, London, and Boulogne. Sometimes they have accomplished nothing; sometimes they have accomplished a little. They have not been willing to seek the realizable. They seek the impossible. As I heard a prime minister remark the other day, "One of the great powers for three years has assiduously fished behind the net." Time and again they have



been willing to do "to-day" that which "to-day" was no longer realizable, although it could have been done six months before.

The prime ministers meet in Paris Tuesday next in economic conference with some prospect of agreement at last, because stubborn prejudgment must give way to actualities, because the governments of Italy and France face bankruptcy, as well as those of Austria and Germany. I say the governments face bankruptcy; I do not speak of the peoples. If I have alluded to the several causes to which Europe's condition is attributable, let me pause again to emphasize the truth that her plight has been aggravated because her governments, matured in the political philosophy of the nineteenth century, have insisted upon subordinating economic to political considerations. The congregated statesmen have hastened the day when John Maynard Keynes's first volume would be justified by established facts; they have made manifest the monstrosity of the treaties, and have made clear to impartial observers that as they choked the vanquished people of Central Europe so they throttled the victorious peoples of western Europe in their struggle for economic recovery.

Mr. President, if I may be pardoned a personal allusion. I told the representatives of the press before I sailed for Europe, nearly two months ago, that I hoped we might find a basis for economic collaboration with the European States. But I fear that if a general conference be summoned at a time when the immediate need is for prompt consideration and prompt action, for urgent and limited action and relief, I fear that a general conference—no matter what the agenda on paper may be—will precipitate a general discussion, inclusive of the cancellation of the debts due America, no less than American political and military guaranties of European frontiers.

If we had not heard read to-day the letter of the President, and Senators required assurance that negotiations are under way, as the President pointed out in his letter, the Secretary of State and the President were in the city of Washington, accessible to all. But was it necessary to confirm the known evidence? The prime ministers met in London a fortnight ago. Three American ambassadors met in London at the same time. Immediately thereafter the American ambassador to Great Britain was summoned to Washington for conference and is now on the high seas. The British Chancellor of the Exchequer is on the high seas following him. The prime ministers are to meet for conference in Paris on Tuesday, January 2, and the British Chancellor of the Exchequer is to meet the American Debt Commission in Washington on Wednesday, January 3.

I alluded a moment ago to the facility with which Senators might communicate with the Chief Executive or the Secretary of State. It is no less easy to communicate with Senators. Frankly, I am amazed that the State Department has been at no pains to keep the members of the Foreign Relations Committee current as to the outline of negotiations now under way. Or rather, I would be amazed if the department had not made the same mistake during the negotiation of the four-power treaty. In this instance I am less concerned about what is due the committee of the Senate or what consideration is due the State Department than I am in the success of the delicate negotiation now under way, and known to be under way.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, does the Senator know what the purport of these negotiations is, what they include?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator does not, but if the Senator had been here a few days longer he could have learned, no doubt, by going to the State Department to ask.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator would take occasion to visit the State Department any time soon, I would be greatly pleased to have him advise his colleagues what the negotiations include.

Mr. McCORMICK. Manifestly, if the amendment pending be necessary, it is because we believe the President and the Secretary of State to be ignorant of the condition of Europe and of the United States, which is known to us; or because we believe them, knowing these conditions, to be indifferent to them and to the suffering of the people; or because we believe them to be neither ignorant nor indifferent, but incompetent to deal with them. That is to say, if we vote for the amendment we do so because we feel that an administration either ignorant, indifferent, or incompetent, or all three, must be prodded to hasten and conclude a negotiation known to be under way. Not only that, but by the broad terms of the amendment, by the very plain implication in it, we would say that we would have this Government invoke a conference which would include everything from American garrisons and guaranties in Europe to European cancellation of debts owed in America.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Would it interrupt the Senator if I said, in regard to the question asked by the Senator from Idaho about what these negotiations include, that I am not in a position to state precisely what they include, although I think it is very obvious to everyone what their limitations might be; but I can say what they do not include. They do not include the cancellation of the debt. I asked that question of the President, and he said:

This administration has been steadily against the cancellation of the debt, and is now.

I also asked in that connection about his reference to the greater latitude to be given to the commission, and he said that referred to the question of time for the amortization of the debt or to the question of the rates of interest.

Mr. McCORMICK. Precisely—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. McCORMICK. If the Senator will permit me to conclude my sentence.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. McCORMICK. The negotiations by the State Department, I assume, like those between the European governments, have sought to find a basis for agreement upon which the tentative Brussels conference could be held, because, as published in the press, none of the governments believed it would be profitable to meet in economic conference at Brussels if that conference were foredoomed to failure by reason of the unwillingness of governments to establish a basis upon which they could negotiate.

Mr. BORAH. The President says in his letter that while the State Department has contended that the question of the debts should be considered separate and apart from the question of reparations, the foreign governments contend otherwise, and that the two propositions apparently are interwoven and must be considered together. Then he suggests that if the Congress desires to be helpful, it will give the debt commission greater authority to deal with this question of the international debt. Does the Senator understand that by that reference the President means that he wants the Congress to change the statute so that the debt commission may have full latitude to deal with the method and manner of disposing of the debt and the consideration of the reparations question?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Massachusetts, I hope, may answer that question, and he has conferred with the Secretary of State.

Mr. LODGE. I asked the President that question. The latitude mentioned in his letter, to which I have already alluded, refers to a greater latitude in regard to the rate of interest and the term of the bond, but it does not in any sense include the question of the cancellation of the debt; and I am authorized to say, as I have said here, that that is not within the consideration of the administration at all and that they are opposed to the cancellation of the debt, as they always have been.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Massachusetts mean that the administration is opposed to the cancellation of any debt of any European power to the United States, even of Belgium or Serbia?

Mr. LODGE. I did not ask the details. I was speaking of the general cancellation of the debt. If one is canceled, I suppose all will be canceled.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not one debt; it is half a dozen different debts.

Mr. LODGE. I know that.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the President says in his letter:

If Congress really means to facilitate the task of the Government in dealing with the European situation, the first practical step would be to free the hands of the commission so that helpful negotiations may be undertaken.

In discussions with foreign governments the previous administration and the present administration have insisted that the question of European debts to the United States is distinct and apart from the question of reparations, but European nations hold a contrary view, and it is wholly inconsistent to invite a conference for the consideration of questions in dealing with which the Government is denied all authority by act of Congress.

The President does seem to desire some authority from Congress to enable him to do what he is now doing, or seeking to do. Do I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Illinois are in favor of modifying or changing the statute creating the debt commission and giving the President greater latitude?

Mr. LODGE. I understand that the view of the President is that there might be greater latitude in regard to the rates



of interest and the time of amortization of the debt, and many people hold that opinion.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from Massachusetts hold that opinion?

Mr. LODGE. I am inclined to think there might be greater latitude given on those points with wisdom; yes. I am not in favor of the cancellation of the debt or of any part of it, because I suppose it all goes together; nor is the administration.

Mr. BORAH. The time is now 25 years?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. About how much time does the Senator suppose it would be necessary to extend it?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am not on the commission and I have made no estimate as to the time whatever, but it is a subject which I think may fairly be opened to discussion, and I think also the rates may be opened to discussion. We have discussed the rates here; we have lowered the rates from what they were.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. President, in this connection it is just as well to recall that the British Chancellor of the Exchequer is on his way to Washington. It is conceivable, certainly, that in proportion as we evince an eagerness to join in a general economic conference, he might prudently evince a disposition to prolong his negotiations, to the end that in the general conference the British debt, with the refunding of which he is charged, might be considered in conjunction with the other debts.

It has taken a long time to convince his Government that we were not disposed to cancel. Patently the signing of an instrument for the funding of the debt of the British Government to the Government of the United States is an important step to a consideration and solution of the economic problems of Europe and to the establishment of terms for the funding of the debts of governments less able to pay than the British Government.

There are Senators who have announced their support of the pending amendment who last summer were demanding payment under the terms of the act of Congress. They have not said to us what they thought might be done in the proposed conference, whether in their judgment additional funds should be advanced to governments which can not pay what they now owe, or to peoples or groups of peoples living under governments which are now unable to pay.

Since the signing of the armistice the Government of the United States has advanced to European governments \$1,500,000,000. It is generally estimated that private advances to Europe since that time have aggregated \$5,000,000,000 or \$6,000,000,000. During the year and a half immediately after the signing of the armistice those advances were great and purchases by Europe in America were correspondingly great. If we would seek just comparisons of exports to-day with those of prior years, they must be made not only with the years immediately following the cessation of hostilities but with the years immediately preceding the outbreak of hostilities.

Mr. President, because some of us shrink from a general conference which we believe will delay the immediate and restricted action which we know to be urgent, it does not follow that we would not find a basis for economic collaboration with Europe. It does not follow, because we are unwilling to propose a conference, the scope of which seems to us almost unlimited, that we do not recognize an economic community between Europe and America.

The great Senator who has proposed the amendment in so doing has bewildered many of us, although he has not diminished our affection or admiration for him. He seeks what we seek, the further diminution of our now attenuated political responsibilities in Europe and the discovery of means for economic collaboration between Europe and America. But I submit that in the all-comprehensive conference he proposes he breaks from the course which he has followed and along which, together with millions of others, we have followed him. Thus to-day we behold Woodrow Wilson, Thomas Lamont, Otto Kahn, and the great Senator from Idaho proceeding along once widely separated but now converging paths to the common goal where they must find Asia, Europe, and America bound together in a death struggle like that of Laocoon and his sons.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is in the company of Woodrow Wilson, he could not find himself in better company than in the company of the greatest peace advocate since Christ was upon the earth. The Senator from Idaho has realized that the plans and policies of the Republican Party up to this time have failed utterly to restore peace in Europe and bring about stability in the business world, including his own country. The Senator from

Idaho wants to see peace established in the world. He is not content to remain silent while the world is in such a disturbed and chaotic condition as it is to-day. The Senator from Idaho is a brave and fearless statesman. I do not believe that he is willing to sit down and fold his arms and seal his lips and permit things to drift and drift from bad to worse. If the Senator from Idaho believes that a step should be taken to improve our own condition and the conditions of the world, I believe that he has the courage to take that step.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] has said that the Senator from Idaho greatly surprised the leaders on the Republican side of the Chamber by this course. We on this side of the aisle are not surprised at that course. The leaders on the other side in the main are content to let things drift. Things are drifting, as certain international bankers would have them drift, in a way that will permit them to get a strangle hold upon the finances and the business of the world. There are those of us who will not be content to permit that condition to obtain.

Mr. President, it is high time that this Congress was waking up. I wonder what it will take to arouse it? Has not the recent election had sufficient effect to bring it to its senses, to a realization of the responsibility that is upon it, to some measure of compliance with the demand for peace and economic adjustment in the world? Why should the Senate remain silent and sit supinely down with folded arms and wait for a partisan debt commission to work out some secret arrangement behind closed doors, away from the gaze of the American public? What is there back of the screen that certain Republican Senators want to hide from the people whose Government this is?

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said this morning that he is opposed to canceling the debt due us by foreign countries, and that the administration is opposed to canceling the debt. I remember when I and others over here discussed in the long session the matter of collecting this debt, that we could not get any very positive expression against canceling that debt from the other side of the Chamber. Where was the Senator from Massachusetts then with his assurance that they intended to collect the debt? They were very quiet about it then, Mr. President. There is no use to hide any of these things. Let us talk about them in the open. My opinion is that the Secretary of the Treasury intended to cancel the debt, and that the administration was favorable to it; and if they have gone from that position it is because they have been driven from it by the Democrats in this body and by American public opinion.

Mr. President, the Republican Party in power can never get away from the blunder it made, from the political crime that it committed, when it solemnly arranged for five Republicans to handle this \$12,000,000,000 foreign debt. When the bugle call of war was sounded our boys from East and West and North and South met on the fields of France. They were Republicans and Democrats side by side, American patriots supporting the flag, fighting for the ideals and institutions of the greatest Government in the world. No partisan consideration entered into the conflict over there. When the men and women of America were digging up their treasure, stinting themselves, many of them buying Liberty bonds, and that money was going abroad to help carry on the war, those men and women did not contribute as partisan Democrats or Republicans. They contributed as American patriots and contributed to the best of their ability. They supported the war in every way possible. No partisan spirit was anywhere manifest among them.

But when the war is over and when the Shylocks of the United States like vampires decide to suck the financial life-blood of the people, then it is that partisan considerations enter in; then it is that the Democratic Party is ignored—a party as old as the Government, a party that never had a scandal connected with its conduct of the fiscal affairs of the Nation, no land frauds ever charged to it, no misconduct in the affairs of the Government that touch the integrity of that party. And yet when the Debt Commission was to be appointed, when we naturally thought there would be Democrats and Republicans alike upon the commission to represent the two great parties which are supposed to speak for the whole people of the country, what did we find? We found the leaders of this branch and the leaders of the other branch of the Congress and the President himself all scheming and conniving together to appoint five commissioners, and every one of them a partisan Republican. Mr. President, that was unfair and unjust. I have never quite understood that very strange conduct. I have my opinion about it. I have expressed it before and I am going to express it again.



There is something that the commission was intended to do that they did not want the public to know. We may just as well talk plainly and call a spade a spade. That was the purpose, I take it, of leaving the Democrats off. It was because they knew when negotiations were inaugurated looking toward a cancellation of the debt that the Democratic members would cry out and would apprise the people of that fact. The failure to appoint any Democrat on that Debt Commission has created suspicion in the minds of the American people. Mr. President, the Democrats are entitled to have representation on that commission. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] has a resolution now pending to appoint three more members of that commission who are to be Democrats, which will make its membership eight. There are now five members on that commission who are partisan Republicans, and three more Democrats would make the commission consist of five Republicans and three Democrats, all of them, of course, to be appointed by the President. Is not that fair? What is there unfair or unjust about it?

Are Senators surprised that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has the courage to come out and say that he is not satisfied with the way these matters are being handled? One of the Republican leaders in the other House stated that it was presumptuous in the Senator from Idaho to make such a suggestion as he has made. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Idaho will be severely criticized behind closed doors in high administration circles. He has probably committed the unpardonable sin against the administration for daring to offer an amendment to the pending naval appropriation bill without first consulting the high muck-a-mucks of the Republican Party. [Laughter.] Is Senator BORAH to be condemned because he wants to save money to the American people rather than tax them to put money into a great naval outlay? Should Senator BORAH be scolded for seeking universal peace rather than to encourage the upbuilding of a big army and a big navy and keeping the world in a state of ferment and war? Yes; Senator BORAH has offended certain interests by offering an amendment that, if adopted, would disturb the program of certain international financiers who have sucked the lifeblood of our country for the past two and a half years. They have fed upon the substance of the American people.

We now have domestic unrest and distress amongst eighty-odd millions of our people. Some of the highbrows who write reports from Wall Street, where stocks have gone up and bonds have advanced in price, immediately get out on the housetop and shout that prosperity has been restored. There is no real prosperity in America now except in the case of a favored few. While Senators on the other side of the Chamber were bragging here on yesterday about prosperity having returned, and some of the paid experts of the big financiers were telling us how rapidly prosperity is coming back, I received a clipping from one of the New York newspapers. There is an organization in New York City which has arranged to have referred to it all letters written to Santa Claus by the children of the country in the fall time prior to Christmas asking for gifts, and they undertake to send gifts to such children.

The writer of this newspaper article states that heretofore such requests had come for toys, for little trinkets, for playthings for the Christmas time. But what do we find this year, Mr. President? One million of the letters which came this year asked for bread and butter. These little waifs, poor little children, made in God's image, are living in sweatshops and tenement houses, eking out a miserable existence, and yet Senators are standing up and proclaiming and newspapers are stating that there is prosperity in the land.

While this condition exists and those children are suffering and starving the farmers of the South and West have products in abundance to feed the hungry and starving people here and some of those in other lands, and yet those products are selling below the cost of production. The Senator from Idaho said truly yesterday that we have an abundance of products in this country which are wasting and rotting while the people are starving for them in other places. There ought to be some way to get the products from those who produce them here over to those who can consume them and who would be happy to have them. Certain countries are in a distracted condition.

America's part in world affairs recently is not a very creditable one. Mr. President, we may just as well be plain; we ought not to undertake to deceive one another.

The Senator from Idaho suggests that an economic conference of the nations be summoned. What harm can come from that? The Bible says, "In the multitude of counsellors there is safety"; but the Senator from Idaho has grievously offended

because he has displayed some wisdom in seeking a "multitude of counsellors," because he is seeking to bring about something that will be for his country's good and the good of the world.

Mr. President, do you know many of those interested in naval matters are opposing the amendment of the Senator from Idaho? The reason is that they make money out of the building of battleships. Could there be a more timely thing than the introduction of the amendment of the Senator from Idaho? The naval appropriation bill now pending carries a larger appropriation than the one enacted just before the disarmament conference met in Washington. What do Senators think of that? We were told that as a result of the disarmament conference we were going to have peace; that we were going to cut down appropriations for war purposes; that we were going to save expenses; that we would appropriate less money; that we would leave money now expended for war purposes in the pockets of the taxpayers of our country. Let us see whether or not we have done that. I asked the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], in charge of the naval appropriation bill, what amount the bill carried. He gave the figures. I then asked him, "Is that larger or smaller than the amount carried by the naval appropriation bill enacted just prior to the Conference on the Limitation of Armament?" He replied, "Larger." Mr. President, is not that sufficient to warrant the Senator from Idaho in trying another experiment? "If at first you do not succeed, try, try again." We have heard that old saying all of our lives, and it is good advice to this day. But Senator BORAH, a Republican, is being condemned because he has dared to throw a brick into the do-nothing show window of the Republican leaders; he is about to break up their secretly arranged diplomatic playhouse, and that is why they are so offended and hurt with him.

Mr. President, the mismanagement, the incompetency displayed by the present administration is simply appalling. It used to boast about what it would do when it obtained power and it went into power, following the administration of that great leader of the American people, Woodrow Wilson, in many respects the greatest intellect that ever sat in the White House. He is 66 years old to-day; God bless him and give him health and spare him to the American people and to the world for many years to come!

Mr. President, he had high ideals; he was willing to fight for them; to suffer for them; yes, and he was willing to die for them, and he almost lost his life fighting for those noble principles and ideals. I sat with him in the White House one day while the death struggle over the League of Nations was going on in this Chamber. He told me of conditions as he had found them abroad; he told me of the hard faces that he had seen, of the dull eyes, the emaciated forms. He told me of the lame, the halt, and the blind; and of the distress and suffering that he had seen in the war-cursed countries of the Old World and of the fields billowed with the graves of millions of dead, and I saw the tears running down his face as he said, "I can not understand why they want to defeat the League of Nations after all that has happened and in the face of conditions that now exist."

Now Senators are saying that he was responsible for the failure to ratify the treaty of Versailles with the League of Nations covenant. It ought to have been ratified with reservations, if you please; but the failure to ratify it by the Republican Senate lost to our country hundreds of millions of dollars in foreign trade and threw away America's opportunity to establish peace in the world. We drew ourselves away and apart under the leadership of the Republican Party and sacrificed our leadership in the establishment of world peace on a permanent basis.

We look over there now, and what do we see? We see Russia in a state of unrest and revolution, the Bolsheviks holding sway in that great and rich country. And what are we going to see? We are probably going to see Germany, once put down as the greatest autocratic power and military despotism in the world, acquire control of Russia with her 180,000,000 population, with her great wheat fields and rich treasure of many kinds. America, under the mismanagement and incompetency of the leadership of the Republican Party, has permitted this thing to go on, and Russia, our ally in the World War—and probably we could not have won but for Russia—has been turned loose to drift and drift until Germany binds poor, distracted Russia to her side with hooks of steel. Then, with the military genius of Germany and with the old desire for vengeance and all of that man power and wealth at her command, we do not know what sort of a problem will be presented to us; but these are some of the results which have been achieved under the Republican administration. If Woodrow Wilson had



retained his health, I believe the league covenant would have been ratified, even with reservations; and if it had been, there would not be heard a gunshot in the Old World today. The world would have been moving steadily toward disarmament in the light and in the bonds of a mutual respect and desire for universal peace. The forces of civilization would have been working in concert to prevent future wars.

But crafty, avaricious interests in league with Republican leaders conspired to defeat that great international institution created to prevent war. And now certain financial interests do not want BORAH'S resolution passed. They do not want any economic arrangements made, except in the way that they are trying to make them, and that is for them to continue to get the cream of the earth and give to the masses the skim milk that is left. That is what they are undertaking to do, and we do not intend that that shall be done.

What else has grown out of this mismanagement and incompetency and aloofness that we have witnessed? The Turk—the beastly, unspeakable Turk—is threatening all Europe, and Russia and Germany are waiting, we are told, and may join with Turkey in the conflict after a while. Oh, Mr. President, how pitiful it all is when we think of what might have been—of what might have been if patriotism and statesmanship had triumphed.

What is going on over there? The blood of the Christian runs red on the sod, and the Turk makes his way toward the temple of God; and what are we doing? We are receiving a message from the President to wait and let things drift. Why should not we have an economic conference between the distressed nations of the earth and America, the incarnated spirit of liberty?

Why, Mr. President, they are murdering Armenians by the thousands. They are slaughtering little children. They are ravishing the women of the white race. Misery and ruin are all around. The trade conditions of the world are disturbed. Economic conditions are bad, chaotic in many places. Let us try, at least, Mr. President, to establish better trade relations with the countries beyond the sea and see if we can be of mutual help and benefit; but the President writes a note in the Christmas time, in the birth time of Him who said:

Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

A message comes at the Christmas time protesting against an effort to bring about a better understanding and peace in the world. God speed the passage of the Borah resolution! The Bible tells us:

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

So if the Senator from Idaho offends a few Republican leaders in the House, or if he treads upon the sensitive toes of the leaders on his own side of this Chamber, if he can by so doing become one of the children of God, I would seize with joy that opportunity any day rather than be called a leader of what is left of the old standpat Republican Party. [Laughter.]

Oh, Mr. President, the old standpat crowd over there do not want anything done except in a certain cut-and-dried fashion. They want it to be O. K'd by these big financiers. They want them all to bow and smile and approve it, and then they will come right up and support it; but if somebody suggests a way of doing it that will really bless and benefit the mass of the people, for whom governments are really instituted, they are ready to oppose it. I wonder how many Republican Senators are going to vote against the Borah resolution. I wonder where the progressives will be when the roll call is had. I wonder who will come out on the side of a better economic world arrangement, universal peace, disarmament, and the preventing of our boys from going abroad to battle in useless wars in the future?

Mr. President, what do they tell us now when we say we ought to disarm as rapidly as sound sense and conditions in the world will warrant? What are we told by the big Navy people, by the big Army people? We are told to wait. "Look over yonder. You do not know what is going to happen over there. War may break out at any time. Therefore put these millions more in this appropriation bill for war purposes." And those who build the battleships will put it in their pockets, and they will laugh and be joyous as they take money out of the Treasury under those conditions. "You do not know what minute war is going to break out," they tell us.

And they insist that we keep on building up for the time being, because they say that we do not know what is going to happen.

What is the Senator from Idaho undertaking to do? He is undertaking to keep anything serious from happening. He is

undertaking to remove the cause, the necessity, for piling these appropriations on the backs of the already overburdened taxpayers of America. He is trying to do that which is best for the American people.

What did we tell them in the campaign just closed? Why, the Republicans told them, "We had a peace conference. We are going to disarm. We are going to save tens of millions in appropriations. We are cutting down the size of our Navy, and everything is going well," and it is not so. Now, then, when we come in and the bill is put in print and is brought here for passage and we ask, as I did, "Does it carry a larger appropriation than before we agreed to disarm?" and they say, "Yes," then somebody has been deceived. Deception has been practiced on somebody, and we ought to talk it out in the open Senate and let the people know just what is going on here.

The President suggests that the hands of this commission ought to be free. Well, I wish I could see their hands. They may be free for some purposes, but they are behind closed doors, where the public can not see. There is not a Democrat in the Nation who knows what they are doing, and therefore none of the rank and file of the people know what they are doing, and I submit that that is a crime against the American people. I do not care whether the man in the White House be a Democrat or a Republican; a Democrat who would provide for five Democrats on a commission like that to handle an indebtedness to the American people of billions of dollars, putting only Democrats in charge of it, leaving out all Republican representation, ought to be severely criticized by the American people.

I am not saying this because the man in the White House at this time is a Republican President, or because the Republicans are in power temporarily. I simply insist that in a matter of that character and magnitude there ought to be both Democrats and Republicans on the commission, so that the American people would know what was going on with this \$12,000,000,000 of indebtedness. Here are twelve thousand million dollars due the American people, and a partisan commission, five Republican politicians, have got hold of it and are manipulating it and handling it and conniving with it behind closed doors, in what way God only knows. They are not going to hear the last of that soon.

There is but one way, Mr. President, to drive from power a party that is misusing the power intrusted to it, and that is through publicity—publicity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD day by day, week by week, and month by month. The people get the facts into their heads, and they let you hear from them at the polls. That is what we have to do. If Woodrow Wilson had been President and he had appointed five Democrats to handle this foreign indebtedness, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge], the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, would have been in his place day after day, and how pious and injured he would have looked when he pronounced that act of Wilson's a great crime against the American people! I can hear him now, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], crying out against that partisan action, "Five Democrats," they would have said, "to handle an indebtedness due the whole American people; five Democrats, with no Republican on the commission to know what they are doing!" I can just see them now, Mr. President, with my mind's eye, and I am going to let them see themselves with their mind's eye quite a number of times before they go out entirely on the 4th of March, 1925.

"Free the hands of the commission!" Well, Mr. President, there ought to be some way by which we can compel that commission to report to the Senate what it is doing. "Oh, that would not do," they say; "you are trying to tie its hands." Well, I would rather tie the hands of that commission than for that commission secretly to tie the hands of the American people. I do not know what they are doing. I do not know what sort of arrangements they are trying to negotiate. I know they have not succeeded in collecting any money, except a little from Great Britain, I believe, who paid some of the interest on the debt due us. We want something done for the people. We want the American people to be represented in a conference. We want to discuss all of the things that will look to better understanding and better trade relations. We threw away our chance at world trade. The Republican Party did that. Now we want to try to build it up or get it back. Are we to be condemned for making an effort along that line? Is the Senator from Idaho to be criticized because he suggests that we try to improve world conditions? Why, if leaders on the other side have been asleep and have not looked into these matters as they should, and the Senator from Idaho has seen a light, I suggest to them that they had better hunt the same light before it is everlastingly too late.



Mr. President, if we can have this conference, and discuss the things that are causing unrest in the world, and do something that will help to settle international affairs justly and fairly the world over, it seems to me we ought to be commended for it. If we could do that we might prevent another war. If Germany is trying to get hold of Russia, and then if Germany, with Russia, is contemplating an alliance with Turkey, as has been suggested, if we could aid in some way in preventing that, would we not be doing a great service not only to our own country but to the world?

Mr. President, there are people all over the world who need our products and we must provide a way for getting our products to them. In 1920, when the Federal Reserve Board advised that the War Finance Corporation be put out of business, they used the argument that American funds ought to cease going to aid our export trade, and by that act they helped to strike down our export trade.

If we can find that a country really needs our products, and by a little help could get on its feet, why not make some trade arrangement with that country? That is what the resolution of the Senator from Idaho may accomplish in the economic readjustment of the world, and through improved conditions and better trade relations we hope to benefit the down-trodden farmers of America. Are we to be discouraged in an effort of that kind?

Mr. President, I think that Senators on the other side should be anxious to vote for a measure like that. They have favored a policy that has brought ruin to agriculture in the United States. Why not do something now to restore conditions which are tolerable to the farmers? I charged before that Senators on the other side permitted Wall Street interests to collect from Great Britain and France \$1,700,000,000 on a private debt, and never collected one dollar interest on the debt due us by Great Britain and France during that period. I charged, and I repeat the charge, that they permitted private interests in Wall Street to hold up the collection of the foreign debt to our country while they collected a private debt. They can not deny that; that was done. I said that if Great Britain and France could pay a private debt to Wall Street, why can they not pay this public debt to the United States? We are tax burdened. Our people are ground to the earth now with taxes.

Mr. President, many a man in the Nation who was fairly well to do in 1918, 1919, and 1920 is now borrowing money to pay his taxes. There is many a merchant who was fairly well to do in that period who has gone to the wall with the sign of bankruptcy written above his door. There is many a country bank which was in good condition in those years now closed and gone out of business. This army of distressed farmers, merchants, and country bankers is hoping that something will take place; that good conditions may return; and here is an opportunity to bring it about by the adoption of an amendment on the naval appropriation bill asking the President to call this economic conference, to invite these people to come here to the United States and sit down and discuss our affairs, their affairs, world affairs in a friendly way. The world is one great community now, with the present means of communication and travel—one great community—and we ought to bring those people here and talk about things that vitally affect us and the whole human race.

Senators on the other side who have always been very silent heretofore about the foreign debt—many who I think were in favor of canceling it and who I still fear intend to cancel it—may have changed their minds. They heard from the American people very strongly in that connection in the last election. But those Senators who now oppose this amendment of the Senator from Idaho are suggesting that its passage might hold out false hopes to somebody about debt cancellation. We can arrange that at the start. We can simply say that this economic conference is called to discuss matters pertaining to their business and things looking toward bringing about more peaceful relations between the various countries and us, but that the debt due to the United States is a part of the obligation growing out of the last war, and that debt must be paid.

There are so many other things of an international character to be discussed. If we could get those people here and talk to them; go over again the ruin wrought by the war; remind each other of the 10,000,000 boys from 18 to 25 years old who went down to death in that terrible struggle; discuss the suffering caused in the world, and how all the nations should work together to prevent a recurrence of another such war, Mr. President, good would come out of it; good is bound to come out of it.

Why is it, then, that we can not adopt a simple amendment like this? It would cost but very little. It would not cost

this Government as much money as the increase in the naval appropriation over the last appropriation as it appears in the bill now pending. That money would be spent in the interest of universal peace, in the interest of better economic arrangements and understanding amongst the nations, and I submit that we are warranted in taking such a step at this time.

I simply rose at this time to express a word of approval of the position taken by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I am a Democrat and the Senator from Idaho is a Republican, but I, as a Democrat, am in favor of his amendment. I think the other Republicans ought to support his amendment, as I believe a majority of the Democrats on this side, and practically all of the progressives in this Chamber, will do so. I hope to see it passed.

Through that amendment I want the Congress to serve notice upon the Shylocks who made their millions and billions out of the last war, who held their Government up in the hour of its peril and fleeced it of millions and billions of dollars—I want to serve notice on them through this resolution that we care more for the boys of America, the girls of America, the fathers and mothers of America, and the peace of the world than we do for them and all the millions and billions they have obtained through questionable methods.

Let us go upon record as favoring this movement for a better international understanding, for better economic conditions in the world, and for better trade relations between our country and the nations of the earth. Let us continue to advocate the settlement of international disputes by arbitration. In God's name, let America wake up and take her place in the great household of the world, and lead in the name of Him whose birth time this is, for peace on earth and good will to men.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	France	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.
Bayard	Gerry	Lodge	Sheppard
Borah	Glass	McCormick	Shortridge
Brookhart	Hale	McLean	Smoot
Broussard	Harris	McNary	Stanfield
Bursum	Harrison	Moses	Sterling
Cameron	Heflin	Myers	Sutherland
Capper	Hitchcock	Nelson	Townsend
Caraway	Johnson	New	Trammell
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Nicholson	Underwood
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Norbeck	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Kellogg	Oddie	Warren
Dial	Kendrick	Page	Watson
Dillingham	Keyes	Pepper	Weller
Ernst	King	Phlips	
Fernald	Ladd	Poin Dexter	
Fletcher	La Follette	Pomerene	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The pending question is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive, on page 9.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if there is to be further discussion of the so-called Borah amendment, I should be very glad if that could be proceeded with, for the reason that the Senator from Tennessee, who offered the amendment just referred to, was compelled to go to one of the departments on official business, and he will not be able to return until a quarter past 3. In his interest, if there is any other matter to be taken up, I ask that the amendment be passed over.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What was the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KING. The Senator from Tennessee was compelled to go to one of the departments on official business and stated that he would be unable to be back until 3 or 3.15, and I asked that his amendment be passed over until his return.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask the Senate to proceed with the consideration of the bill and to pass over the amendment temporarily. The bill is open to amendment as in Committee of the Whole, I understand.

Mr. KING. If there is to be any further discussion on the Borah amendment, I should be glad if it might be proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee will be passed over temporarily. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Has everything been disposed of now except the last paragraph, with the proposed amendment to it, I inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill?



Mr. POINDEXTER. All the amendments proposed by the committee have been disposed of. The bill, of course, is subject to amendments which may be offered by any Senator.

Mr. BORAH. If the debate has closed upon my amendment so far as the multitude opposing it are concerned, I desire to say a few words in regard to it. I understand, however, that there are other Senators who wish to speak on it. In order that we may come to an understanding about the matter, I ask that we agree to take a vote upon the proposed amendment, which I shall offer later, at 3 o'clock to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say that the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] desires to speak upon the amendment. I am sure, however, he will not be prepared to speak to-day, but will be prepared to-morrow.

Mr. BORAH. I certainly do not desire to cut off any Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON entered the Chamber.

Mr. BORAH. I will say to the Senator from California that a vote is about to be taken upon the amendment which I propose to offer, and I understood that the Senator desires to speak upon the matter to-morrow. If the Senator desires to request that the matter go over until to-morrow, I shall be very glad to approve of it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do I understand that the Senate is ready for a vote, with the exception of a possible speech from me?

Mr. BORAH. I have a few remarks to make with respect to one matter and then I shall be ready for a vote myself; but I do not want to bring it to a vote until the Senator is ready to speak.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would not permit for an instant any desire on my part or any speech of mine to interfere with the vote. If the Senate is ready for a vote, I would not ask that the matter go over. I do know, however, that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] desires to be heard upon the subject, and I have been told that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] wants to speak upon it. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], I understood, too, was going to offer a "few feeble remarks," and I have no doubt there are other Senators in a like situation. However, so far as I am personally concerned, I would not ask for a continuance of the subject until to-morrow.

Mr. BORAH. I do not desire to cut off debate upon either side of the question. I simply want to get the matter in such a condition that Senators can protect themselves for the discussion; that is all. I am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, that it shall go over until to-morrow. I would be very glad to have it go over.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In view of the statement made by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I see no reason why we should not proceed with the consideration of the bill. Of course, it is open for discussion and subject to amendment. It has now been under consideration for a number of days, and the question that is raised by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho, which has been printed but has not yet been offered, has already been discussed at great length. I ask that we proceed in the regular order with the consideration of the measure before the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to say to the Senator in charge of the bill that so far as I am concerned I shall be very glad to vote now or to vote at any time this afternoon, but there are a good many Senators who want to be here when the vote is taken. If we could fix an hour this afternoon or an hour to-morrow to vote on the particular amendment which is to be offered, which is the point of interest in the bill, so far as the vote is concerned, I think it would help the convenience of the Senate and expedite its business.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion. In fact, I think the Senator from Idaho did propose a unanimous-consent agreement to vote this afternoon at 3 o'clock. That hour or any other hour that may be agreeable to the Senate is satisfactory to me.

Mr. BORAH. I proposed 3 o'clock because I understood the debate had closed, but I understand now it is not closed, and I do not want to cut off debate by any proposal of mine. I want those who desire to discuss it to have ample opportunity to discuss it on either side of the controversy.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask, has a point of order been raised against the proposed amendment?

Mr. BORAH. The amendment has not yet been offered.

Mr. HARRISON. Where does the Senator propose to offer it? Does he intend to offer it as a substitute for the last paragraph on page 56 of the bill?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. If there is going to be a point of order raised on the amendment, why could we not argue the point of

order if there is no one ready to proceed at this time on the merits of the amendment?

Mr. BORAH. I am not going to offer the amendment until the debate is closed, because I know what is going to happen to it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the Senator mean so far as the vote is concerned?

Mr. BORAH. So far as the point of order is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON. I know what I hope will happen to it.

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator's hopes are going to be realized.

Mr. JOHNSON. I trust they will be; they are the same hopes the Senator from Idaho has entertained in the past.

Mr. BORAH. They are by no means the same, nor anything like it.

Mr. HARRISON. I submit the Senate never does a revolutionary thing, and if we will follow the precedents the amendment is in order. I do not think the matter should be prejudged until it has been presented. The Presiding Officer is a very fair man, and I am sure—

Mr. BORAH. It was not a criticism, either express or implied, upon the Presiding Officer, but there seems to be no doubt about the proposition that the precedents are supposed to be in support of it. Whether they are or not, I have not examined.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Senators have gone so far as to say what will happen to it. I give notice now that there will be an appeal from the decision of the Chair if he does hold that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from California desire the matter to go over until to-morrow?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not ask it, because I think I ought not to do so. I do not think I am justified in asking the Senate to delay its action to listen to remarks of mine. I can not conceive that they are of sufficient importance to delay the action of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. I do not agree with that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is very kind, but, so far as I am concerned, whatever the Senate sees fit to do will be perfectly satisfactory to me in that regard.

Mr. HARRISON. In view of the fact that the Senator believes the decision will be to sustain the point of order and notice has been served that an appeal to the Senate will be taken if the point of order is sustained, and which would be debatable, does not the Senator think we should not enter into an agreement to vote at a certain time?

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator addressed that remark to me, I made no request to vote at a certain time. I am willing to agree or not to agree, just as seems agreeable to the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. If there is no one else going to request that it go over, I shall not do so, but I would be very glad to have it go over if anybody else wants to have that course taken. However, I shall not ask that it go over.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me for a brief announcement?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

#### DEATH OF DR. WILBUR F. CRAFTS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the International Reform Bureau wishes me to announce that the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, superintendent of the International Reform Bureau since 1895, died in this city on yesterday, December 27, 1922, and that his funeral will be held at 4 p. m. to-day at the Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, at the corner of Fourth and B Streets SE.

Mr. President, Doctor Crafts throughout his life exerted a great and wonderful influence for good and that influence will permanently survive him. Among the things in which he was interested and which he helped to promote were the spread of religion, law enforcement, moral education on a Bible basis in school and out, the creation of a public sentiment for a higher moral environment and a better world here and now, the suppression of intoxicants, gambling and other commercialized vices, substitution of recreation for dissipation, protection of the young against narcotics, one day's rest in seven, encouragement of reading with a view to inspiration to usefulness, arbitration and conciliation instead of industrial and international war.

Doctor Crafts was devoted to the best interests of humanity, as all Senators will testify, and his loss will be deeply mourned.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.



Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I ask to be indulged by the Senate a few moments while I express a hope that the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] may be favorably acted upon by the Senate. I do not think that this is any time for political or partisan play. It makes no difference to me now, so far as this amendment is concerned, whether the Senator who offers it agreed with me or not when the Versailles treaty was submitted to the Senate for ratification. It makes no difference to me now, Mr. President, whether the past performances of the present administration have been such that it should be commended or criticized. There are times and there are occasions and there are measures that should rise above partisan consideration. The question of whether the world shall go on down to destruction or shall find some basis upon which its differences may be accommodated and peace and prosperity again shall be established on the earth is one so vital that, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to forget all other questions and look to that alone.

If one wished to be captious and critical he could express some amazement at the suggestion of the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who was unwilling that a conference should be called unless the administration should be so hedged about by reservations and amendments that nothing could be done except the thing pointed out in the resolution. It evidences an amazing lack of confidence either in the intelligence or the patriotism of the President of these United States to suggest that if he were authorized to call a conference it would be unsafe to let him do so unless the Senate should so hedge about the questions that should be considered, under his call, that the President could not do a foolish thing. I am willing to trust the President to set out in his call those matters that are vital and which should be considered.

I have more confidence in the President of these United States, even though I have been accused of being overly critical of him, than has the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROTH], who expressed the same grave fear that the President might err if he were clothed with power to act, unless his powers were circumscribed by amendments and reservations. I am willing that the President shall be trusted. I say that, although I know that the President does not wish to call the proposed conference. We knew that before his letter was read to-day. We know equally well that he was opposed to the Limitation of Armament Conference which was held here a little more than a year ago. He wrote a letter then asking that it be defeated. He held conferences with Senators and asked that the armament conference resolution be not passed. One of the Senators, who was in charge of the bill when the amendment proposing the Limitation of Armament Conference was offered—I refer to the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]—said:

I will say that I went to see the President with the Senator from Washington—

Referring to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER]—and we talked over the question of disarmament, and I gathered from what was said there that the President thought it was not necessary for Congress to go ahead in this way with a resolution asking for disarmament.

The President afterwards wrote a letter opposing the resolution. That letter did not find its way into the Record, but the Senate for some reason saw fit to disregard the opinion of the President then and the Washington Limitation of Armament Conference was convened and a limitation of armament was agreed upon. A treaty with reference to the Pacific islands was also negotiated and ratified by the Senate. I know, Mr. President, that recently the Washington Limitation of Armament Conference was pointed to as one of the great achievements of the present administration.

The conference was held, as I have said—and I refer to it not in a spirit of criticism but merely to show that the President was opposed to that conference—and the very same Senators who now offer objection to the conference proposed by the Senator from Idaho were opposed to the Washington conference. The Senator from Massachusetts was opposed to it; he was honestly and sincerely opposed to it. I am not criticizing him for that. There comes a time, Mr. President, in some men's lives when they are afraid of the future; when they want to take no step forward. They are not to be criticized; it is their viewpoint that they want always to look backward, as if they thought there was nothing but an open grave ahead.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. HALE. From the Senator's statement in regard to what I said on the floor of the Senate last year, I gather that he implies that I meant that the President was opposed to the holding of a limitation of armament conference?

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course. I thought the Senator meant what he said.

Mr. HALE. Such a construction is entirely foreign to my meaning, and I have never before heard of such a contention being made.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is it the Senator's intention now to say that the President was in favor of the adoption of the Borah resolution?

Mr. HALE. I do not think he was.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course not; and that is what I said.

Mr. HALE. I think that the President felt that it was unnecessary.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. HALE. And that is the impression I tried to convey in the Senate at that time.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is exactly the impression the Senator from Maine did convey—that the President wanted the Borah resolution killed.

Mr. HALE. I think the President thought it was unnecessary for the Senate to take any action.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is exactly what the President says about the conference now proposed.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. But the Senator from Arkansas is conveying the idea, if not stating it in express words, that the President was opposed to a conference—

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. And not that he was merely opposed to the resolution?

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not care how the Senator from South Dakota wishes to split hairs now—

Mr. STERLING. I am not splitting hairs, Mr. President. It is the Senator from Arkansas who is evading the real question.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not evading anything. I say that there would have been no Limitation of Armament Conference if it had not been for the adoption of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Idaho; and there would not have been a Limitation of Armament Conference if either the Senator from Maine or the Senator from South Dakota could have prevented it.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota would not have lifted his hand toward preventing such a conference.

Mr. CARAWAY. And he would not have lifted his hand to have brought it about, either.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from South Dakota has understood all the time that the President was in favor of the conference but not in favor of the resolution which was passed by the Senate.

Mr. CARAWAY. Where did the Senator from South Dakota get that information?

Mr. STERLING. I can not give the source of my information now exactly in regard to that, but it has been my understanding all along that the President was in no sense opposed to a conference.

Mr. HALE. I object strongly to having the Senator say that I was opposed to the holding of a conference, but I was opposed to the resolution of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course.

Mr. HALE. I was in no way opposed to the conference.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator was opposed to it, and then voted for the resolution.

Mr. HALE. I do not recall how I voted.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, yes; the Senator did vote for it. The Senator got his orders and voted for it. I am not criticizing Senators who wish to follow the administration.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is the habit of sheep.

Mr. CARAWAY. As the Senator from Missouri suggests, it is a matter of habit.

Mr. President, I did not intend to impugn anyone's motives. I do know, or else I have been very much misinformed, that a year ago a Senator now sitting on the floor received a letter from the President asking him to kill the Borah resolution. The President also wants to kill the amendment of the Senator from Idaho now pending.



Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, will the Senator specify to what Senator he is referring?

Mr. CARAWAY. I think the Senator from Washington knows to whom I refer.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I do not know.

Mr. CARAWAY. Did not the Senator from Washington receive a letter from the President asking him to kill the Borah resolution?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did not.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then, some one else is very, very much misinformed, because my information is that the Senator from Washington received such a letter. I will ask the Senator if the President did not express the hope that the Borah resolution would be killed?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Not to my knowledge. He never expressed any such hope to me.

Mr. CARAWAY. He did not ask the Senator to have it killed?

Mr. POINDEXTER. He did not.

Mr. CARAWAY. Was the Senator present when the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] talked with the President?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I may have been present on one occasion when the Senator from Maine talked to the President.

Mr. CARAWAY. Here is what the Senator from Maine said in the Senate on the 13th day of May, 1921:

I will say that I went to see the President with the Senator from Washington—

That is the Senator with whom I have just been having a colloquy, is it not?—

and we talked over the question of disarmament, and I gathered from what was said there that the President thought it was not necessary for Congress to go ahead in this way with a resolution asking for disarmament.

Did the Senator from Washington get that same impression?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, perhaps I ought not to get into this controversy; but, in view of the labored effort of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] to change the actual facts, if the Senator will look at the Associated Press dispatches upon the day on which the able Senator from Maine and the able Senator from Washington left the White House, he will find an Associated Press dispatch to the effect that the President did not desire the resolution to be adopted and that, in their opinion, Congress would stand by the wishes of the President.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not happen to have the dispatch to which the Senator refers, but I know that was the general impression. I will inquire of the Senator what was the date?

Mr. BORAH. I do not remember the date, but it was the day the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Washington conferred with the President in regard to this matter.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, there might be an easy way to settle the controversy. Senators did confer with the President in regard to this matter; that is admitted. Suppose they tell us what the President said. We should like to know.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course they are not going to do that. I would have asked them to do so, but I knew they would not do it, because they have declined once before. I heard the Senator from Washington decline to do so. I know, however, that the Senators referred to came back from the conference and both of them announced that they were against the resolution. No one ever knew either one of them to fail to hear the voice of the administration, and therefore I know what the administration said to both of them.

Mr. President, that was entirely foreign to what I intended to say. I am not falling out with anyone for following the administration. I am not intending and had not intended to criticize anyone. I had hoped that the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho might be adopted. I was merely showing that the President's attitude toward the Borah resolution a year or so ago was the same as his attitude toward the pending amendment; but even he afterwards and all of his adherents talked of the great benefit that grew out of the Washington conference, to which the President was, I am sure, thought to be opposed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I will read from the New York Times Index for April-June, 1921, an article which is reprinted in the New York Evening Post of December 26, 1922, under the heading "The Story of Five Weeks." The article is as follows:

#### THE STORY OF FIVE WEEKS.

[From the New York Times Index for April-June, 1921.]

"House debate; row over disarmament, April 27, 19:1; Editorial, Disarmament Logic in House, April 27, 16:3; bill adopted by House without important changes; Representatives fail to force amendment

which would force Harding to call disarmament conference, April 29, 17:8; President Harding, conferring with Senators POINDEXTER and HALE, warns them that he does not want 'hand forced' on disarmament question, May 4, 1:5; Harding opposes insertion of BORAH's proposal into bill, May 4, 2:5; Senate committee agrees on bill adding \$100,500,000 to that passed by House; Senate committee rejects BORAH's proposal for conference between United States, Britain, and Japan, and House committee decides informally to drop disarmament agitation following Harding's talk with Senators; BORAH offers new amendment; POMERENE offers proposal calling for delay of six months in beginning building program provided for in bill to enable Harding to call conferences, May 5, 1:1; Representative STEVENSON asks House to reject Senate increases, May 6, 4:3; BORAH in statement says he will push disarmament plan, May 10, 1:2; Senate considers bill, May 13, 19:5; Senate debate; BORAH, in tilt with CURTIS, says Congress is raising, not cutting, costs; Kenyon and NORRIS assail measure and call for halt in building program, May 14, 1:6; deadlock in Senate; Senator POMERENE supports disarmament proposal; Senator KING wants naval holiday called and completion of ships less than 10 per cent completed stopped during holiday, May 17, 19:3; Harding is believed to have withdrawn opposition to BORAH's disarmament amendment; Republican Senators allowed to vote as they wish; POINDEXTER tells of having sent letter to Harding, May 18, 1:6; economy advocates make \$1,000,000 cut in bill; other changes, May 19, 17:8; Central Trades and Labor Council adopts resolution asking Senate to pass Borah resolution, May 20, 17:2; line-up on vote for amendment; pay increases also fought, May 24, 10:2; Senate rejects House proposal to cut down personnel; line-up of votes; LENROOT says Harding was misquoted to make him appear advocate of big navy; other amendments add largely to appropriations, May 25, 1:3; Senate adopts BORAH's disarmament amendment; text of amendment, May 26, 1:5; Editorial, 'Mr. BORAH's Triumph,' May 27, 16:1." BORAH's amendment to the naval appropriation bill calling for a conference on world economic conditions and reparations is being frowned upon by administration leaders.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, Mr. President, everybody understood the situation. It is strange how quickly some people forget. I am not criticizing, nor did I intend to criticize, the President for being against the Borah resolution then or now. I was expressing the hope that, in view of the great ends to be accomplished, Senators might find it within their power to think of what might be the benefits and cast aside any political bias that they may have because the President happens to oppose it.

I do not know whether I am as good an American—and I want to speak with all kindness—as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] yesterday afternoon asserted he is. He served notice that nobody could be a constituent of his who was not an American. He did not want any Irish-Americans, or German-Americans, or Italian-Americans to be considered as constituents of his. I do not know that I can go that far. I never found it in my heart to hate people. I do not hate any race of people. I never found it in my heart during the war to rejoice when the newspapers told about the hunger that stalked in Germany and how children starved, tugging at their mothers' withered breasts. I did not hate the German women and children then. I do not hate them now. I do not hate any class of people that were engaged with us in the war. The war is over. I do not seek any political advantage that might come from the adoption of this resolution. I do not want to say, as some have said, that it would be a vindication of the position of the past administration and a condemnation of this. I want to say that the man who represents his people, and does it wisely, must be controlled by conditions as they now exist, not by what was true last year. It is the present condition that we must meet; and the Senator who can not forget the past, and, because he hated some people last year, must hate them this year, will never, I fear, support any progressive measure. I do not know whether the present condition of Europe impresses people as it does me. I shall, however, say this, and you will pardon the personal note.

I had an opportunity this year to observe the condition in seven or eight of the European countries, among them France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other countries of middle and eastern Europe. The impression I got then, which stays with me, is that unless some relief or solution for its economic ills is found all of central and eastern Europe must sink in ruin. Whether we can see two hundred and fifty millions of people go down to destruction and not be destroyed with them, I do not know. I do not believe we can. I do not believe anyone who has not obtained firsthand information can understand the economic distress, the actual want, the lack of power to help themselves that confront these people of Europe. I know that I got no pleasure out of viewing it. I get none out of its remembrance. It may be that others can, that they feel they should hate all who are not American. I can not.

I know that in all the great cities of Europe, in those countries in which I was, when you saw a crowd of women standing in front of a shop window, packed in so that it was almost impossible to obtain a view of the window, when you got through that crowd of women and children to learn what attracted them you would not find it a display of dress or jewelry, but one containing a piece of meat or



a loaf of bread. I saw men—men of character and standing—come into hotels or the restaurants with a piece of bread wrapped up in paper under their arms, buy a cup of coffee, and sit down to a meal of nothing else, and then get up and go out. I know that the professors of the best known medical school in the world were starving until an American made it possible for them to eat one meal a day that cost between 4 and 5 cents each.

I know that the consul of this country in one of the greatest industrial cities in Germany told me last summer that the charwoman who cleaned their floors on the Fourth of July was given a present of a hen; that when she received it the tears trickled down her old withered face, and she said: "This will be the first bite of meat I have tasted in eight years." I know that you can go through countries like Austria or Germany and Hungary and see the conditions that confront those people and know that unless some kind of an arrangement can be made whereby they can reestablish themselves, anarchy must follow. Take Austria, with 6,000,000 of people, 2,000,000 of whom live in Vienna, with the entire agricultural products of that country not sufficient to feed the population two months, without any raw materials, surrounded by hostile people who have been taught to hate by hundreds of years of conflict, and you must know that Austria can not survive under the present conditions.

I do not know what this country can do. I do not know what an economic conference can accomplish. I do know, however, to refuse to do anything will bring no relief. I do know that action might be helpful, and inaction can not accomplish anything. I know that thousands and thousands of men, women, and children—but especially women and children—will go down to their graves this winter, victims of starvation, if these Senators shall have their way who say: "Let Europe solve its own problems and save itself."

You can not escape the responsibility. You may say: "I shall not assume it," but you can not escape it. You can not refuse responsibility for what happens in the other parts of the world however you may say that you will not assume responsibility for it, because the power lies within your grasp to take some action. You are not responsible if you act upon your best judgment and your action proves futile. You can not guarantee that the step you shall take will bring the relief for which you pray; but you will at least have maintained your self-respect and rendered unto the world all the aid you could, because you took whatever action seemed to you wise; but you can not escape responsibility if you simply say: "I will not act at all."

I do not know how much of hatred lives in the hearts of the people of America. I do not know. I do not know how many people would rejoice to think that starvation will stalk the streets of Berlin and Vienna this winter. I for one shall find no pleasure in it. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] in his speech before the Senate a few days ago said that the mistake which we made—I want to quote him accurately if I can find the Record; it was last Friday—that the thing we ought to have done was to have marched into Berlin and collected reparations then, when England and France and Italy and America had an army of millions of men in Europe. In other words, the Senator from Washington believed that you could have settled all the problems with the bayonet; that murder and destruction of property would have brought prosperity. Well, it never did in the history of the world; it never will, the Senator from Washington to the contrary notwithstanding; and the Senator expressed regret also that we did not send our armies into Russia to overthrow the government there established and set up another government, whether it pleased the people in Russia or not.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. CARAWAY. I shall read the Senators' remarks if he has any doubt about that being his position last Friday.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did say what the Senator has just quoted. I am very deeply convinced that if we had carried on the war until it had come to a conclusion and to such a point that there could not have been any controversy about whether or not the German army had been defeated—and it is now claimed by Germans that it was not defeated—and such reparations as were collectible had been collected at the time, and Germany then freed from any further military control and allowed to proceed to reestablish herself we would then have avoided this world menace which is now proclaimed and which undoubtedly exists, arising from the effort, after four years of controversy and of world disturbance, to collect reparations from Germany, because after all that is the question which is at the bottom of the economic problem of Europe.

So far as Russia is concerned, what I said was that while we were in the war, and while the Allies had armies of trained

men and veterans, if they had supported the party which existed in Russia and which was led by men of great ability, in my opinion, called the Constitutional Democratic Party, I think, that was in favor of a constitutional democracy, the world would have been relieved also of the still greater menace which now exists and which is undoubtedly carrying on propaganda in the United States, of revolutionary Bolshevism. I may be mistaken, of course, about that view, but I am very firmly convinced of it, and the Senator has accurately quoted me.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat. He thinks it was a mistake not to have gone with our armies into Germany, to Berlin, in 1918? Is that the Senator's view?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. The Senator is just repeating what I have already said.

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, wait; I want to ask the Senator another question. Is he now in favor of organizing an army to go to Berlin?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I certainly am not, Mr. President. The very fact that I am not in favor of it now, and that it can not be done now and that it ought not to be done now, is the reason why I believe it ought to have been done while the war was on.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me ask the Senator another question. I hope he will not quit this discussion quite so abruptly. Why could we not get the same effects by invading Germany now that we could by invading it in 1918? It is the same German people.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, the Senator is too able a Senator, and too intelligent, to fail to see the difference between starting another war four years after the war closed and carrying it on to a successful conclusion while we were engaged in it.

Mr. CARAWAY. I can conceive that the Senator thinks the war was a failure as it ended, but that if it had gone on it would have been a success. I should like to ask him what reparation we could have collected from Germany with an army of invasion in 1918?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would not like to undertake to make an inventory of what we might have collected. If we could not have collected anything at all, we would have discovered that fact. I think there were stores of government property and of government wealth, which we are now seeking futilely to get, which could have been taken then if it had been the will of the Allies to take them; and the threat of the world now, of which the Senator speaks, and advisedly and truthfully speaks, is the threat of taking reparations from Germany. Of course, if we could not have gotten them then, what hope is there of getting them now?

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator is the one who was advocating taking them by force of arms, and I thought he had some particular property in view which he thought the armies might have seized. No one would advocate the prolongation of war and the killing of men unless there were some object which could be reached. I had thought myself that when an army laid down its arms was not the time to invade the homes and murder the women and children. It may be that the Senator from Washington has so much better ideas of how to carry on a war than I have that he can see some advantage.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think either one of us could set himself up as an expert on how to carry on a war. I imagine that my views about that are just about as good as those of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. I want to ask the Senator another question, if he disclaims he is a great soldier. He wanted us to invade Russia, which was our ally, in 1918. Does he still hold to the idea that we ought to reassemble our armies and invade Russia and overturn the government? It is the same government that it was then.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator asks a great many questions, and bases many of them upon false premises.

Mr. CARAWAY. Where is the falsity in that premise? Let the Senator answer that, and then give me an answer to my question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will be glad to do that, because I am prepared to answer the question. The false premise the Senator laid down—and I only state my impression—

Mr. CARAWAY. I am sure the Senator is right about it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Is that the Bolshevik Government of Russia was our ally. I deny that, and my opinion is that it was our enemy and the enemy of the world. It is carrying on hostile propaganda in the United States to-day. It was bought and paid for by Germany and is sending money into the United



States to-day with the avowed purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States. I deny it is our ally, or ever was our ally or our friend.

Mr. CARAWAY. Nearly 9,000,000 Russians laid down their lives fighting for the same cause for which we fought. The Senator says they were our enemies. They were dying with us and dying for us, but praying against us. Of course, I realize the falsity of a premise of that sort, but which one of us assumed it I shall leave unanswered. I want to ask the Senator another question; he is interesting. The Senator makes the statement that Russia is sending money into the United States now to carry on a propaganda. From what source does the Senator get the information that that is true?

Mr. POINDEXTER. From various sources. I have reports from investigations which have been made, and also from open statements which have been made by the agents of the Bolshevik Government of Russia, among others Mr. W. Z. Foster, recently arrested by officers of the Government of the United States for revolutionary activities in the United States, who boasted of the large amount of money he had brought back from Russia for the purpose of carrying on revolutionary propaganda in this country.

Mr. CARAWAY. I did not know he had ever been in Russia. That is the first information I have had that he had been in Russia. I knew Mr. Haywood went over there; but he is still there.

Mr. POINDEXTER. And he is begging to get back.

Mr. CARAWAY. Haywood?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. There are some people here who would be delighted to see him.

Mr. POINDEXTER. He went over there with the idea that it was a sort of an economic paradise.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; he went over there because he was under sentence to the penitentiary, and some people were foolish enough to go on his bond, and he jumped his bond and went away.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The people who went with him have been starving and freezing, and I took occasion not long ago to read a report giving the names of certain American travelers who had passed through Russia and seen some of those people, and who repeated their conversations with them, a very good side light on economic conditions in Russia which have been established by these "friends" of the United States, as the Senator calls them.

Mr. CARAWAY. I have never said that Bolshevism was a friend of the United States. It was not to fight Trotsky and Lenin that the Senator wanted to send armies into Russia in 1917, if he wanted to support the Kerensky government, because neither Trotsky nor Lenin was there at that time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas is mistaken about that.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; I am not.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. Lenin had then been in Russia for some time. Mr. Trotsky went there a short time before. He was arrested en route by the Canadian authorities at Halifax and held in custody. The British Government filed a protest against allowing him to proceed to Russia.

The activities of Mr. Lenin in Russia at that time were well known; but they were not interfered with by the weak government which existed in Russia at that time or by the Government—I will not characterize it in its relation to Mr. Trotsky—which existed in the United States at that time; but I will say that through its influence Mr. Trotsky was released and allowed to proceed to Russia. Then they carried on their activities and established a hostile and alien government in that country. However, the period about which I was talking a moment ago and to which the Senator referred when he spoke about marching an army into Berlin was not in 1917 but it was in the autumn of 1918.

Mr. CARAWAY. If I may be permitted to say it, then the Senator is somewhat mixed in his history, because there were no leaders in Russia in 1918 for us to support.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Had they all been killed? What had become of them?

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not such a great authority on what became of them as is the Senator from Washington. I know that the Lenin government was in full control of Russia in 1918, except for an army that was backed by France and then deserted. However, I am not falling out with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, just in the interest of historical accuracy may I suggest that the Bolshevik revolution occurred November 8, 1917, I think, and since November 8, 1917, Lenin and Trotsky have been continuously in control of Russia.

Mr. CARAWAY. Does the Senator understand that Kerensky was a Bolshevik?

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, no, no; I was just fixing the date when Lenin and Trotsky came into control.

Mr. CARAWAY. I think the Senator is entirely in error as to when Kerensky came into power.

Mr. JOHNSON. It was before that. The revolution occurred November 8, 1917.

Mr. CARAWAY. When was it that Senator Root went to Russia?

Mr. JOHNSON. Prior to that.

Mr. CARAWAY. What month?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think it was in the spring.

Mr. KING. It was in June, 1917.

Mr. CARAWAY. Possibly I am in error as to my date. I am willing to accept the statement of the Senator from California, who seems to have accurate knowledge. Anyway, Kerensky's government was not in existence when the Senator from Washington says he would have had an army invade Russia and uphold our friends, because Kerensky had left Russia long before that time.

However, Mr. President, controversy leads nowhere. I had gotten up to express the hope that for once at least the Senate might forget its war with itself, or its abject truckling to the powers that be, or its hatred of the powers that be. There ought to come a time when we are willing to let measures be decided upon their merits.

Referring to what the Senator from Idaho said yesterday, I know that an invisible tax collector stood by the side of every farmer in America last year, the year before that, and this year. Whether the farmer was husking his corn or threshing his wheat in the Northwest or picking his cotton in my Southland, that invisible tax collector stood by his side and took one-half of everything he produced. That invisible tax collector is called "Isolation." That is the price we pay in order to have nothing to do with Europe. That is the price we are paying now. The farmers of America are paying this year, in the loss of markets, as much as half the debt Europe owes us, of which we are speaking. They lost that much last year. They are paying more, in order that we shall have nothing to do with Europe, than the entire expenses of conducting this Government for a whole year. That is the price you are levying upon the producers of America. If it is worth it, if you get enough satisfaction out of seeing women and children starve in Europe to warrant you in levying that burden upon the producers of America, you must be your own judges in that matter. But whatever the condition is, and whatever the remedy may be, I take it that in the last analysis you will have to answer for yourselves and your party for your action here to-day.

I do not say that any Senator who opposed the reconciliation of Europe, by the methods which I believed, ought to be criticized. I do not say that he was wrong, although I think he was. But whether he was right or wrong, I do know—and this is all I intend to say—that if you shall vote that this amendment shall not be adopted, that there shall be no economic conference, you will be condemning thousands and thousands of women and children to their deaths, and you can not escape that responsibility. You can say that no good can come of adopting this resolution, but you can not prove it. You know that unless some action is taken death must stalk through all the countries of central Europe this winter, and if you are unwilling to make one effort to save them you must carry your responsibility.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has made a very impressive speech. I am very sorry that I missed a part of the colloquy. I wondered if he had referred to the power of hunger as propaganda of revolution.

Mr. CARAWAY. I did not.

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to submit a few observations upon the pending amendment and to offer an amendment to the amendment, which I will send to the desk in order that it may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. FRANCE. I ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment to the amendment.

The READING CLERK. In lines 2 and 3 strike out the words "such governments as he may deem necessary or expedient" and substitute therefor:

The States signatory of or adherent to the convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes of July 24, 1899, and their successors and other States since recognized.

So as to read:

That the President is authorized and requested to invite the States signatory, etc.



Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is to make it certain that if this conference is called the participants at the conference will be all of the principal nations of the world. While I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho, I feel that it is very important that we do not again call a conference consisting merely of the three empires of the world and this one Republic. I hope that at the conference which may be called the influence of the three great empires of the world, with their imperial policies, may be counterbalanced by the influence of this Republic, supplemented by that of the other Republics of the world.

Mr. President, the opposition to the proposal for a general international conference is not sudden. It is a settled, stubborn opposition. It is the organized opposition of the great interests of the world which have brought the world to all but utter ruin. The proposal for a general international economic conference is not new. On the 14th day of January, 1919, I offered a resolution providing for a general economic conference. In February, 1920, I again offered a resolution providing for a general economic conference. When the last Borah amendment for calling the disarmament conference was pending I was about to offer my resolution providing for a general international conference as a substitute for the Borah amendment when I was assured that if I did not do so, if I would let the matter as it then stood come to a vote, my resolution providing for a general economic conference would be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee. It was not so considered, nor have the other resolutions which I offered bearing upon the European situation been considered.

After my journey to Russia in 1921 I offered a resolution based upon a knowledge of Russian conditions, the only accurate knowledge then available for this Government, the knowledge which I had obtained there. I offered a resolution, based upon first-hand information, which provided for the sending of an economic commission to Russia and the inviting of a Russian commission here. Neither the resolution providing for an economic conference nor the resolution providing for dealing with the Russian question was even considered by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

That reveals a deep disease from which we are suffering here, the disease which caused the Senate to so largely abdicate its powers during the Great War in favor of the executive department, a most dangerous proceeding. The executive department can not know, no matter how competent it is, all of the problems of the country and all of the problems of the world. Its wisdom must be supplemented by the wisdom of men elected fresh from the people, and by the knowledge obtained by legislators who take the trouble to investigate or even to go to foreign lands to find out the true situation.

Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss the European situation at this time, but I can not let the occasion pass without saying something as to conditions there.

Hardly had the armistice been signed, hardly had the joyous voices, the tumultuous shouting and the vibrant tones of the victorious bells announcing the end of war died away upon the chill November air before some of the Senators who, in spite of being in public life, are yet interested in public questions and not solely in political questions—and the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is one of these—began to realize that the acid difficulties of the reconstruction period would test the resources of the world's statesmanship even as they had not been tested by the problems of the war.

Senators can scarcely realize the situation which confronts the world to-day. In the Senate Chamber, surrounded by all the comforts which we have here, it is difficult for the imagination to run out over Europe and over the far reaches of Germany, Austria, the Near East, Russia, and Siberia, where the real problems for statesmanship lie. If the newspapers should suddenly announce to-morrow morning that during this very winter there would come a war to Europe which would mean the sacrifice of 15,000,000 lives it would be a startling piece of news. I want to say that I believe—and I can support my belief by figures—that more than 15,000,000 people may meet death in Europe this coming winter from starvation because of the refusal of the parliaments and the leaders of the world to fully comprehend the situation which confronts us. It is a situation which imperils the very foundations of our civilization.

Talk about propaganda! Talk about governments being overthrown by insidious propaganda! Why, Mr. President, I am surprised that a Senator of the United States should give voice to such an utter fallacy. Is there a boy reading the history of the world in his elementary school who does not know that revolutions are never caused by agitation, by propaganda, by discussions?

Revolutions are caused by conditions; and when we create the conditions which bring about revolutions they will come. Until those conditions exist they will not come. Hunger is the most potent cause of revolution. Even our Bolshevik friends know that. Even those Bolsheviks whose policies have been so greatly criticized by men who knew nothing about them admit the fact that until conditions are ripe for revolutions propaganda and agitation will not bring them about.

But I want to say that the conditions this winter in Europe, if we do not act, will be ripe for revolution, and the red tide of anarchy may sweep the continent of Europe, may even reach England, and possibly cross the Atlantic to this most fortunate land; although I believe that here, in spite of many evidences to the contrary, we will be able to withstand even the most adverse conditions.

In passing, it might not be inappropriate for me to refer to the fact, only mentioned by the distinguished statesman from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]—for he is a statesman, even if he is a Senator—to the effect that already there were signs of deep unrest in the United States. The violation of certain of our Federal statutes has reached such a point that it may be called anarchy. Following the violation of the prohibition statutes, which we were quite sure would be violated if enacted—and for that reason I opposed them—there is now reported a wholesale violation of the statute against counterfeiting our currency. The Senators from the Northwest can tell us that while the patient farmers there are peacefully waiting for some solution of their problem, government has ceased to function, and governmental functions and activities are practically dead in portions of the Northwest because the funds ordinarily secured from the farmers through taxes are not available because the funds are not there.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRANCE. I will yield in a moment. Recently I had gone to Chicago, at great inconvenience to myself, hoping that I might be able to arouse some of the business men of that great metropolis to the seriousness of the situation confronting this country and the world. Coming back from Chicago I met a delegation of farmers from the Northwest who told me of conditions there which were far worse than anything I had dreamed of. I saw a county paper from a South Dakota town in which there were perhaps 1,000 farms advertised for sale because the farmers could not meet their taxes.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I hope the Senator will not be quite so general in his statement with reference to conditions in the Northwest. I have the honor to represent in part a Northwestern State. There is nothing of the kind with reference to the government ceasing to function in the State of Wisconsin nor any other State in the Northwest that I know of so far as the functioning of the government is concerned.

Mr. FRANCE. I meant to say to the Senator that the funds which are necessary for the maintenance of some county governments in the State of Wisconsin are not available because the farmers in the State of Wisconsin can not generally meet their taxes. That information I received from a resident in the Senator's own State, and there were several other residents of his State in the delegation.

Mr. LENROOT. There are many farmers in the State of Wisconsin who are in dire distress, but there is no government or agency of government in Wisconsin down to the smallest township that is not functioning to the fullest extent.

Mr. FRANCE. I thought I had made myself clear in stating that when a government can not through taxation secure the funds which it requires for the conduct of its business then it must sooner or later cease to function. It is certainly the case in many of the Northwestern States that the farmers have not the money with which to pay their taxes, and that is the only way of raising money for governmental use.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will the Senator tell us of a single Northwestern State or a State anywhere that is not able to keep its courts or its county offices open? I would like to have the name of such a State.

Mr. FRANCE. I think I have covered that question quite fully. I was alluding to three specific examples of what I wished to allude to, merely in passing, of an indication that all of our governmental functions in the country were not going on in the usual healthy manner.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But the Senator made a statement which, if it is incorrect, is very unfortunate and very damaging.

Mr. FRANCE. I think the record will show what my statement was. My statement was that in a single county—and it



can be duplicated by many other counties—substantially all the taxpayers who are farmers are unable to pay their taxes.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The fact that the farmers are unable to pay their taxes is quite a different thing from the fact that the government has ceased to function. On the other hand, instead of this country being in a condition where it is unable to keep its courts open and carry on the civil business of the country, there is more money being expended in public improvements in the United States to-day than at any period of its history, and these improvements have been voted by the people and are being paid for out of the revenues collected from the people.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, can the Senator from Missouri cite me any State, county, or municipality in the United States which pays for its public improvements out of revenue? The distinguished Senator from Idaho a few days ago called attention to the danger of our mounting public debt, and I myself have some figures upon that very point. That is not a sound condition.

Mr. REED of Missouri. It is true, of course, that a great majority of the public improvements are being made out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds; but it is also true that the best financiers in the world take those bonds without question and at low rates of interest. They would not do that if government had broken down. Moreover, in all of the States about which I know anything provision has been made for the payment of interest and a sinking fund and the taxes are being regularly paid. I know of no greater injury that can be done to the economic situation of a country than by the proclamation of a bankruptcy that does not exist. This country is not bankrupt; our States are not bankrupt; and if they were, so much the more reason why we should not undertake to carry the load of Europe.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Missouri. One moment. We are told that we are as rich as Croesus. That is, when it is desired that we shall go over to Europe and spend our money there. The next moment we are told that we are going to pieces because we have no money and that we are on the verge of starvation. Which end of this proposition do gentlemen intend to take?

Mr. FRANCE. That is a very simple question for me to answer, for I never take but one end of any proposition where our international relations are concerned, and that is the American end. I wish to say in that connection that I have heard a considerable amount of internationalism talked in this Chamber by Members on both sides. I am no internationalist. I would not sacrifice one dollar of American interests or make America sacrifice one single iota of her privileges to save Europe from ruin. I have but one care, and that is the care for my own country. That care for my own country is based upon the belief, which is a part of my being, that the only idea adequate to heal the agony of this disordered world is the American idea. I would not jeopardize this American idea by sacrificing a single American interest to save the millions of Europe from starvation. It is only because I believe that the conditions in Europe are such that our own institutions are being menaced that I think the time has come for us to act and for us to attempt to assert the leadership of the American ideal in the affairs of the world.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I hope the Senator from Maryland did not understand me, although a part of his remarks leads me to think he may have so understood me, to intimate that he was preferring the world over the United States. I cast no such aspersion on the Senator. I know he is just as much of an American as am I. I want him to understand that. I wish, however, to say that the point that I make is that in one breath we are being told that the people of the United States are impoverished to the point where they are likely to become Bolsheviks, and the next moment we are told that we are so rich and so prosperous that we can carry the burdens of the world. Both of those propositions can not be true; and it is time in this debate to get down to a few plain facts.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Missouri for his contribution to the debate. He knows in what high esteem I hold him, considering him one of the great statesmen of this body. I was merely saying, in passing, that the conditions in this country are most unsatisfactory.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. FRANCE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The voice of the Senator from Maryland reaches very far. I do not like to sit here in silence, especially in view of the suggestions that have been developed in the colloquy, representing in part one of the Northwestern States, and allow to go unchallenged the statement of the Senator that government in those States has broken down.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I merely wish to say a word. I am familiar with the conditions in a number of the Northwestern States. I am familiar with the conditions in the State of Washington, which I in part represent; I am familiar with the conditions in the States adjoining that State, and in a number of other States in that section of the country. I think I am as familiar with those conditions as is the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and I can state not only that I do not know of any breaking down of government, but I can say affirmatively and positively that government has not ceased to function, but that it is functioning; that the State authorities are exercising their jurisdiction under their respective constitutions; that the courts are open; that the county governments are carrying on the work of the people; that all of the municipalities are actively engaged in the administration of the laws of an orderly, well-conducted, and free people.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I take no exception to the misinterpretation or the misquotation of my words. I am accustomed to that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would not misquote the Senator.

Mr. FRANCE. I merely mentioned in passing the situation of the Northwest. It is as I have told the Senator. Thousands of farms are for sale in the Northwest because the farmers can not pay their taxes. I am a countryman; I come from a county which is supported by its farmers, and I know that if the farmers generally of my county can not pay the taxes it will interfere with the normal operation of governmental processes in that county. That is my proposition, and I maintain it now. I expect to see, of course, the Tory press tomorrow come out with the statement that "Senator FRANCE has stated that all governmental functions in the United States have suspended"; and if Senators who are listening to me can not understand my words any better than to put that interpretation upon them, how can I expect the newspapers, with their own games to play, with their own purposes to serve, with their own masters to obey, to put any better interpretation upon my words?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is not much opportunity to misinterpret the statement that government has ceased to function.

Mr. FRANCE. If I said that government has ceased to function, I think what I said in the paragraph made my meaning perfectly clear; but if it is not clear, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment. I have never said that government had totally ceased to function in any part of the United States. I was not laboring under that impression; I have not that impression, and I did not intend to convey that impression. I intended to say just exactly what I have stated to the Senator; and I think that the Senator would do well to inquire into agricultural conditions particularly in Oregon, Washington, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana if he has not done so.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRANCE. I only intended to submit a few observations, but at the present rate I am afraid that my observations will consume the whole of the afternoon.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was merely going to ask the Senator a question. I should like to ask him if he has made any calculation of the amount of taxes, a share of which the farmers of whom he speaks have to pay, that have been imposed upon the people of the United States by the loans of money and the gifts of money which we have already made to Europe? I might suggest in supplementing my question that we loaned Europe a principal of something like \$10,000,000,000, on which there is now said to be an accumulated interest of something like \$1,000,000,000, making a total of \$11,000,000,000 in round numbers, and probably considerably more than that. I remember it is not long since we made a direct appropriation of \$20,000,000 out of the Treasury to buy food for Russia; that not long before that we appropriated \$100,000,000 to form a revolving fund for the purchase of food for various countries of Europe; and in addition to those amounts still further amounts have been appropriated out of the Treasury, and there have been literally hundreds of millions of dollars donated by private subscription out of the wealth of the United States, out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States for the relief of various portions of Europe and Asia.

What I should like to ask the Senator is how he expects, in view of the picture which he is drawing of the distress of the farmers of the United States, calling attention particularly to the farmers of the northwestern section of the United States, to relieve that distress by going still deeper into their pockets to pay out money to foreign countries?

Mr. FRANCE. I am very glad the Senator has asked that question, because it is a question which it is the purpose of



my remarks to answer. The Senator's mind evidently has been anticipating what I intend to say. I might preface what I have to say by stating that my proposition is not to take one dollar away from America for any purpose. I would have this country in the position of a creditor who is seeking so to rehabilitate his debtor that he can recover some of his loss.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that all of the speeches which have been made thus far have been general in character. I hope the Senator in his remarks will tell the Senate and the country what he thinks America ought to do to meet the situation. Let us do away with generalities; let us get down now to exactly what we can do, and what the American people ought to do to meet the situation. The passing of resolutions will not do it. In what way does the Senator want the relief for Europe to come from America, and how can it be extended?

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, there is no man in the Senate to whom I would rather present my plan than the Senator from Utah, for he is a wise Senator and a very sound business man. It is true that the passing of resolutions will not solve the difficulty, nor will the refusal to pass them solve the difficulty. I have already presented my plan several times to the Senate. I have not been able to secure any considerable amount of attention to my plan, chiefly, I will say, because of the vicious practice which has grown up in the Senate of passing every problem up to the Executive for solution. If it had been considered by the Senate to be its duty to wrestle with our problems due to European conditions, the Senate would have considered the plan which I have presented, which in my judgment is a sound plan for the liquidation of the international debt. Some may not agree with me; some may say that my solution is not a sound solution; but it is a solution, and it is like a banker's solution, and it is a businesslike solution, and unless that solution is accepted I ask the opponents of it to propose something else. We must find a solution for the difficulties which confront the world or we will allow Europe to plunge to utter ruin.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that the Secretary of the Treasury a year ago asked Congress for certain powers in order to meet the situation existing at that time; and it is no better to-day than it was, but is growing even worse. He asked that Congress give the commission to be appointed through an act of Congress the power to refund the obligations. He asked that they be given the power to extend the payment for 40 years, and he asked that the rate of interest be not named in the act itself, but be left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury or the administration, so as to deal with every country according to the situation of that country and the conditions existing at the time the settlement was made. He asked also the power to treat the interest upon those obligations in a way that would take care of them at some time in the future, by the payment of monthly payments or yearly payments, or whatever plan might be adopted.

The Senator knows that Congress held that act down to the granting of only two powers. One was that the extension of time should not exceed 25 years. The other power granted was to reduce the rate of interest upon the obligations as it exists to-day—namely, 5 per cent—to not less than 4½ per cent, and to add the accumulated interest to the principal of those debts. That is all the power that was granted the commission, and I do not believe Congress knew at the time that every country in the world that was owing the Government of the United States, except possibly England, could not meet those conditions. I will say to the Senator now that what has happened since—and the information that has been brought to the commission is such that it is impossible for me at this time to go into detail, and it would not be wise for me to do it anyway as a member of the commission—has demonstrated beyond a question of doubt that those debts can not be paid by foreign countries, as was contemplated in the passage of that legislation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is very apparent from the letter which came in from the President to-day, and from the argument of the Senator from Utah, and from the other propaganda which is going on in the country, that while we are talking about not canceling the debt, it is proposed to put the matter in such a condition that for all practical purposes it will be a cancellation.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want the Senator to intimate that I have such an idea. On the contrary, I have stated my position openly and publicly so many times that I did not think anybody even thought for a moment that I had such an idea.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the American people are not interested in this debt as a mere memento, to lie down here in

the archives of the Treasury for an indefinite length of time, until the seventh and eighth generations shall have passed over. But it is the plan, and has been the plan for weeks, to extend these debts so indefinitely that instead of an actual cancellation it will be a practical cancellation.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that not a scintilla of evidence has been submitted that I know of that would justify such a charge against the Foreign Loan Debt Commission.

Mr. BORAH. I am not talking about the commission. I do not know that the commission has any idea of such a thing, but that view is being advanced by powerful interests.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator now that I have not a doubt but that every member of that commission would be opposed to any cancellation of the debt.

Mr. BORAH. Why, of course they are opposed to the cancellation of the debt. I am not speaking about the wishes or desires of the commission as an individual entity or the actual open cancellation. I am speaking now of the plan which is being put forward, and which we are advised to-day we must go to the State Department to get our information concerning in a confidential way, to take the limitation off the commission. I do not have to go to the State Department to know that that scheme has long since been on.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that what I stated was in answer to a statement that was made by the Senator from Maryland, brought out by a question that I had asked the Senator from Maryland—that before he concluded his remarks I should like to have him submit some proposition, or his ideas, at least, as to how these debts from the foreign countries can be met and what he recommended for immediate action in order to relieve the situation in Europe.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I shall be very glad, if time permits, to refer to that subject, to which I have already referred on a previous occasion.

Referring to the statement by the Senator from Idaho as to the scheme for settlement of the foreign debt, I would say that is very simple. I do not know whether the Senator from Utah is familiar with it or not, but I am. The scheme is very simple, and I for one am very glad that the Senate took such action as to make that scheme unworkable by specifying a near date for the maturity of the bonds and by regulating the interest charges.

There are two classes of debts owing to the United States by the European countries. The one class is composed of the debts with interest owed by government to government, amounting to some \$11,000,000,000. That debt is not giving the international bankers of New York any great concern; but there is another debt owing by Europe to this country which is giving them concern, and that is the debt owing to them—a debt represented by open accounts and bills payable in the banks; a debt amounting perhaps to a sum between four and six billions. Two years ago, according to a careful estimate by one of our leading banks, it was approximately \$4,000,000,000, and since that time it has been added to. In other words, there are two classes of debts, the debts owed by governments abroad to our Government and those owed by Europe to our private bankers and investors. Included in that debt, which is made up of open accounts, is, of course, the debt represented by the old Anglo-French bonds which are now in the boxes of these bankers and of their customers. The proposition of the international bankers is to have this Government indefinitely postpone the debts owing to this Government in order to render the investments of the bankers more secure, and the Senate by wise legislative action headed off that proposition. In other words, the international bankers who themselves have European paper in their banks and the bonds of European countries in their boxes want to take care of their interests first by deferring for a long time the payments due from their debtors to our Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that that situation does not relieve anyone in Europe. It does not get them back to work. If all that the Senator has said were true—

Mr. FRANCE. It is true.

Mr. SMOOT. If the international bankers held the obligations of these countries for even the amount that the Senator states, the question before the Congress and the country and America, as all the speeches have led us to believe, is that there must be immediate relief in some way. What I want the Senator to tell the Senate and the country is, How are we going to give that relief? Where is it coming from? From what source? Does the Senator believe the time has arrived when the Government ought to extend further credits to these countries without the payment of the interest that is now due upon the obligations that those countries owe America? Does he think for a



moment that the international bankers in this country and in foreign countries are going to advance further loans to these countries under the conditions described by him as existing in those countries?

We have to look at the thing in a business way. No human being living would like to relieve the suffering of Europe any more than I; but the question is, How are we going to do it? From what source is the relief to come? If it is to come from international bankers, as the Senator intimated that they are holding obligations of four or six billion dollars, they are not going to advance any more money unless they know that they are going to have some chance of that money being returned. That is just as natural as life itself. Now, the question is, Does the Senator think that we ought to advance them more money? If so, to what countries, and upon what conditions?

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, it is a very simple proposition. The Senator criticized the Senate for not acquiescing in the plan of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; the Senator misunderstood me. I simply stated the situation, and the Senator knows that what I stated is absolutely true.

Mr. FRANCE. Perhaps I should not have used the word "criticized," Mr. President; but the Senator certainly suggested that the Senate did not acquiesce in the plan of the Secretary of the Treasury for dealing with these debts. Certainly the Senate did not, because the plan was not adequate. It merely provided for a deferment of payment. Now, any banker knows that you can not generally relieve a debtor merely by deferment of his payments.

There are three things for a banker to do if he has an insolvent debtor. First, he must defer payment. That is inevitable. He has no choice in that.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that that is exactly what we have in Europe in a great many of the countries.

Mr. FRANCE. I say, that is inevitable. If the debtor is insolvent, the deferment of payment is automatic.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not saying that England is insolvent. I am not saying that any of the other countries are insolvent. I am not going to particularize; but the Senator knows that many of the countries that owe the United States are insolvent, and those are the very countries where the suffering is taking place. Now, how are we going to relieve that situation?

Mr. FRANCE. If the Senator will permit me, I will give him what would be a banker's answer. The answer would be this: Deferment of payment is the first step. The finding of assets which might be utilized in the settlement of the account is the second step. The rehabilitation of the debtor is the third step. Those are the three steps—first, to defer payment; second, to find assets which might be used in liquidation; third, to rehabilitate the debtor.

The Secretary of the Treasury, a great financier and a pre-eminently distinguished banker, only suggested deferment of payment. He did not suggest examination of the assets, nor did he suggest any plan for the rehabilitation of the debtor. All three of those things are indispensable.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the Senator as to that. But let us consider the case and see where we land. I suppose nobody will deny the fact that in order to relieve the situation Germany has to be relieved in some way.

Mr. FRANCE. That is true.

Mr. SMOOT. She must receive assistance from some source. If Germany should apply for a loan from the international bankers of any country, those bankers would say, "What security have you to offer? How are we to feel secure for the repayment of the money we lend you?" The Senator knows that the reparations imposed upon Germany are such that she can not meet them. Her man power and productivity of the soil are not sufficient to meet the reparations that have been demanded of her. Is there any property in Germany, as long as those reparations stand as a first lien against Germany, that she could give for any further advance of money to relieve her of the stress she is in?

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I appreciate the intelligent comment of the Senator from Utah, and we might discuss this matter at some length. I understand, however, that it is desired that a vote be had; and I do not wish to delay the vote, though I would prefer to proceed with my argument. But I wish to say, in passing, that I am not so unsophisticated as to be advocating a loan to Germany with an indeterminate liability in the shape of impossible reparations standing against her. Very shortly after the Versailles treaty was presented I began to contend—and for many, many months I have been contending—that the German reparations should be reduced and that we, as a creditor of Germany's creditors, should see that something be done to relieve Germany from paying these impossible reparations.

I have heard some talk to-day about the wonderful Versailles treaty and what it might have accomplished. A number of Senators on this side of the Chamber, some of whom are business men, voted for the Versailles treaty with reservations. Yet when the treaty of Versailles first came to the Senate the late distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Knox, a great statesman, a student of international affairs, and a student of finance, rose in his place and said in effect that the worst part of the Versailles treaty was not the League of Nations part, but the reparations part, and that if we attempted to place those reparations upon Germany we would hold back the reconstruction of the world for many years. Some of the viper press of the United States, the disloyal tory press of the United States, dared call the great distinguished Senator, Philander C. Knox, of Pennsylvania, of late lamented memory, a pro-German because he suggested the inevitable reduction of the German reparations, the attempt to pay which is keeping Europe to-day in distress, as we all now begin to recognize.

It was estimated by an eminent economist a year ago that at the rate at which the mark was then selling the total income of all the German banks, of all the German public utilities, of all the German industries at the then value of the mark was equal to \$4,000,000,000 each year. That is an estimate by a distinguished banker of Boston, W. Irving Bullard. The reparations fixed against Germany, he estimated, amounted to \$5,000,000,000 annually. Yet the total income from all of the German banks, industries, and public utilities was only equal to \$4,000,000,000, one billion of which had to go to meet fixed charges and one billion of which had to go to meet depreciation, leaving a balance of a possible two billions for the reparations payment, when five billions had been fixed. Of course, it is well known that the reparations payments demanded of Germany are helping to create the situation in Europe to which I am about to refer.

I have long since advocated a reduction of the German reparations, and there is, I will say in passing, somewhere on the dusty files of the Foreign Relations Committee a resolution which probably has never been read by any considerable part of that committee, certainly has never been considered, providing for two things: First, for the liquidation of the debts owed us by certain governments by transfer to us from them of certain assets which they have and which can be transferred, and for a reduction of the total German indemnity to \$15,000,000,000, which is the maximum amount which any economist thinks Germany can possibly pay.

Mr. SMOOT. What character of assets had the Senator in mind when he drew the resolution?

Mr. FRANCE. The former German African colonies and cables, transferred by Germany to the allied and associated powers, of which we were one. That may seem to be an unreasonable solution, but it is a solution. It would result in the liquidation of the debt, it would result in the restoration of the exchange rates, and it is a sound business solution. I mean to say it is a solution which a banker would consider, for I have said there are three things which a banker must do with an insolvent creditor—defer payment of interest and principal, seek assets which can be used for the liquidation of the obligations in order that the debtor may begin to buy again, and find means for the rehabilitation of the debtor.

The situation of our debtor, taking Europe as a whole, is this, that Europe can not buy the things necessary for her rehabilitation because she already owes us so much that the exchange situation prevents further adequate buying. The liquidation of what she owes us and the rehabilitation of her productive power must go hand in hand. That is true with reference to the restoring of any insolvent debtor to solvency. You must liquidate what he owes in order that he may buy more, in order that he may restore his productive capacity.

Mr. SMOOT. If that were all, and we were simply relying on the fact that there must be goods sold to Europe, I could answer that by saying that in this year, 1922, we exported more goods than we did in 1921. We exported 60 per cent more goods in 1922 than we exported the year before the war. So it is not the power of Europe to purchase our goods that is producing the unbalanced conditions in the world. It is far deeper than that. I grant that that would have a bearing upon the exchange values of money between countries. There is no doubt of that at all. But I was surprised to learn that the exports of even the products of the farm, of which we speak, have greatly increased, and in some respects they are greater this year than they have been at any time, with the solitary exception of 1918 and 1919, during the period of the war, when everything was bought at enormous figures.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, the very dominating Senator from Utah wants me to make my remarks in the order which he chooses rather than the order in which I had chosen to



make them. I would say that I feel very happy that I am able for once to put the Senator in the wrong on figures. His figures of the exports this year, which show that our exports are greater than those last year, are certainly in error. I had intended to refer very shortly to the very subject to which the Senator has alluded in his remarks, and if the Senator will allow me to proceed until I finish—

Mr. SMOOT. I will; but I simply want to say to the Senator that my figures are from the Department of Commerce, and I have a letter of transmittal here, and can tell the Senator in detail what the articles were and the amounts. They will go into the RECORD before we get through with this discussion.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I might accuse the Department of Commerce of almost everything except putting out two sets of figures for the same transactions. I also have figures from the Department of Commerce, which are quite the contrary to those of the Senator from Utah. In fact, my figures from the Department of Commerce show that in the 11 months of 1922 we exported \$3,490,345,750 worth of goods, as compared with \$4,188,832,983 last year, showing a falling off in exports this year, in the 11 months, over last year of \$698,487,233.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has not the figures for the full year?

Mr. FRANCE. This is for 11 months.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Washington.

Total values of imports and exports of the United States.  
(Preliminary figures for 1922, corrected to December 16, 1922.)

MERCHANDISE.

	November—		11 months ending November—		Increase (+) decrease (—).
	1922	1921	1922	1921	
	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	
Exports.....	383,000,000	293,092,219	3,490,345,750	4,188,832,983	-698,487,233

EXPORTS OF MERCHANDISE, BY MONTHS.

Exports.	1922	1921	1920	1919	1913
	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.
January.....	278,848,469	654,271,423	722,053,790	622,036,726	227,032,930
February.....	250,619,841	486,454,090	645,145,225	585,097,012	193,996,942
March.....	329,979,817	386,680,346	819,556,037	603,141,648	187,426,711
April.....	318,469,578	340,464,105	684,319,392	714,800,137	199,813,438
May.....	307,568,828	329,709,579	745,523,223	608,967,025	194,607,422
June.....	335,116,750	336,898,606	629,376,757	928,379,203	163,404,916
July.....	301,157,335	325,181,138	651,136,478	588,687,515	160,990,778
August.....	301,771,692	366,887,538	578,182,691	646,054,425	187,909,020
September.....	313,093,285	324,983,123	604,686,259	595,214,266	218,240,001
October.....	370,720,154	343,330,815	751,211,370	631,618,449	271,861,464
November.....	383,000,000	294,092,219	676,528,311	740,013,585	245,539,042
December.....	.....	296,198,373	720,286,774	681,415,999	233,195,628
11 months ending November	3,490,345,750	4,188,832,983	7,507,729,533	7,239,009,991	2,250,822,664
12 months ending December	.....	4,485,031,356	8,228,016,307	7,290,425,990	2,484,018,292

Mr. SMOOT. I have an estimate of the exports for 1922, and I will put all the figures in the RECORD.

Mr. FRANCE. They are the estimated exports?

Mr. SMOOT. We have to estimate them for the last few days.

Mr. FRANCE. I am very skeptical about such an estimate. I am dealing with the 11 months of 1922, as compared with the 11 months of 1921, and I know that there has been a falling off of about \$690,000,000 in the 11 months.

I had not intended to detain the Senate so long, but here is our situation: The world is short of goods, and distressingly short of food. For more than four years millions of men in Europe were engaged in destruction, withdrawn from the peaceful and plentiful production of food and commodities and placed in the work of destroying life and destroying goods. It is perfectly apparent to all students of European conditions that the productive capacity of Europe since the war has not been restored, and therefore Europe is alarmingly short of all sorts of goods—cotton, wool, manufactured articles, and food products.

At the same time, with Europe to-day needing for her rehabilitation all kinds of commodities as desperately as she needed other commodities for the purposes of the war, our exports have alarmingly fallen off. Because of her failure to reconstruct her productive industries, Europe is in a desperate financial situation. As the Senator has already said, the budgets of Europe do not balance. I shall not discuss the British budget or the budget of any particular country, but a fair striking of any balance sheet in any country of Europe would show that the budgets do not and can not balance.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator does not mean to imply that because we have not contributed to the reconstruction of European industry the budgets do not balance? He does not allege that undue expenditure, unrestrained expenditure, which we would regard as amazing in this country, is not responsible for those deficits?

Mr. FRANCE. We could not be amazed by any expenditure for naval or military preparation. That is inconceivable. We are too accustomed to spending money for those purposes to be amazed. But if the Senator will allow me to proceed, I think I shall be able to develop my argument a little more clearly than if interrupted, and I have been asked to conclude as soon as possible—at which I am not at all surprised—in order that we might have a vote.

Here is the situation in general: In 1913 the aggregate debts of all the countries were \$43,000,000,000. In 1918 they were \$205,000,000,000. In 1919 they were \$295,000,000,000, and in 1922 the total aggregate debts of the countries reached \$400,000,000,000.

Of course, that does not mean the European countries alone. In addition to that there is an increased fixed charge for interest on this additional debt of approximately \$15,000,000,000.

In addition to the increase of \$15,000,000,000 annually in fixed charges there has been one absolute loss in income due to the killing and serious maiming of approximately 10,000,000 men. Those 10,000,000 men, on an average, might be considered to be capable of earning about \$500 each, making a deficit in the loss of their earning power and in the loss of their productive capacity of approximately \$5,000,000,000. This would make a total loss from the increase in fixed charges due to interest and the decrease in productive capacity due to loss of man power of \$20,000,000,000 each year.

In addition to that apparent deficit there is the other deficit to which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] has referred—the deficit which is represented by increased expenditures for naval and military appropriations as compared with the same expenditures before the war. Then, of course, there is the increased expenditure owing to the fact that those who are maimed and disabled must be cared for by government pension. So there is an apparent deficit, taking all of those items into consideration, of possibly between twenty-two and twenty-four billion dollars annually in Europe.

Now, what is the proposition? It is a business proposition. The world as a whole is not earning its fixed charges, because its charges have been increased, its productive capacity has been decreased, and its productive power is decreasing because the means are not at hand for the rehabilitation of the productive power. With the increase in the fixed charges and decrease in earning in the world, there are only two alternatives. One is insolvency—and the insolvency of any of the great European countries, even Germany, would certainly produce an all but disastrous effect here, and the insolvency of all would be sure to produce it. We dare not consider insolvency. Then we must turn to the other horn of the dilemma and consider whether it is possible for us to increase the productive capacity of Europe and the world sufficiently to meet the increase in fixed charges. The logic is inevitable. We must either choose an insolvency because of the increased fixed charges, which amount to from twenty-two to twenty-four billion dollars annually, or we must find some way to increase the income of the world by increasing the productive capacity of the world.

There is the problem. What can be done about it? Something must be done, and we can not do it by sitting here wishing somebody would find a way. The only way it can be done is to call into a conference all of the great nations to see how in each nation the productive capacity of that nation may be not only restored, for that is not enough to prevent insolvency, but increased as well.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But, Mr. President, if we were to increase the production of goods in Europe, what would we do for a market?

Mr. FRANCE. That is not a hard question to answer at all. I say that the world is short of goods, short of all kinds of manufactured commodities; and if that be the case, we need not worry about the market. A market can be found. I have already had some observations to submit on that question.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Did not the Senator vote practically to exclude suffering Europe from the American market?

Mr. FRANCE. I hope not, I will say to the Senator. Of course, it is very difficult to discuss any question here without



discussing the tariff question. The tariff law which we enacted, whatever any other Senator or Member of Congress might call it, to me was an emergency tariff law—nothing more, nothing less. It was an antidumping law. We did not call it an emergency tariff law, but that is what it was, comparable in every respect to the safety of the realm act which was passed by Great Britain and which carried tariffs quite comparable to the tariffs carried in our law, and which also carried a provision for a sliding scale adjustment there by a committee which was formed under the English law for that purpose, the functions of that committee being comparable to the functions the President will perform here under the sliding scale process, so that the tariffs might not be inequitable and such as to absolutely prevent imports.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But the Senator said they are starving over there, so we passed an emergency law to keep them from bringing their goods over here and selling them quickly. Three or four years from now we will have a sliding scale that will let their goods in; but by that time they will all be dead, according to the Senator's theory.

Mr. FRANCE. No, Mr. President. I perhaps did not clearly state what I intended to state, and that is that the safety of the realm act of England and our tariff act, which I call an emergency act, both had for their purpose the making up by a tariff of the difference in the cost of production abroad and the cost of production at home. It was not intended to be a tariff wall; and I am quite sure that if it shall appear that all exports are being stopped by the tariff in any particular schedule, the tariff will be adjusted. That was my theory of the law, and on that theory I voted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that the figures will not justify the statement made by the Senator from Missouri. The tariff law was enacted September 22 of this year. October was the first full month during which the law was in effect. In October, 1921, we imported, of all goods, \$343,330,815. In October, 1922, we imported \$370,720,154. We imported more goods after the passage of the tariff law than we did before its enactment.

Mr. FRANCE. I thank the Senator for the contribution.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator want to let that stay just that way?

Mr. SMOOT. How does the Senator want me to let it stay?

Mr. REED of Missouri. How much wool came in—6,000,000 pounds?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no!

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does not the Senator know that a large part of that was made up because we had passed the so-called emergency tariff law that was very high in its rates, and when we enacted the new law lower rates than the emergency tariff rates existed, and thus let the goods come in which had been banked up waiting for the enactment of the new tariff law? The rates contained in the new tariff law were lower than those of the so-called emergency act, and that accounts in part for the importation. Is not that the fact?

Mr. SMOOT. There were 107,000,000 pounds of wool held in bond waiting for the passage of the tariff law. Of that 107,000,000 pounds of wool that was in bond, there have been about 80,000,000 pounds withdrawn, and a rate of duty of 31 cents a pound on the scoured basis has been paid. If 100,000,000 pounds of wool had been brought in and paid for after taken out of bond, that would only have been \$31,000,000 on all of the wool. So that it does not account for the increase in the imports of goods since the enactment of the law. It accounts for \$31,000,000, and that is the whole of the amount of duty.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Well, Mr. President, if that is the case—

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I must decline to yield further, as I must conclude my remarks. I hope Senators will allow me to conclude. I do not wish to delay a vote upon the Borah amendment and I do feel that the observations which—

Mr. REED of Missouri. We are not going to have any vote to-night, I think, on any amendment.

Mr. FRANCE. I think it is the desire to have a vote.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. FRANCE. I am sorry that I can not yield further to the Senator from Missouri. I would do as much for him as for any Senator, but I feel that I must conclude. I feel that before a vote is taken upon the amendment the Senate should be advised of certain of the facts which I desire to present as briefly as possible.

Before I take up the figures which I had intended to present I want to say that to my mind immediately after the armistice there seemed to be three problems: First, to restore Germany as a productive nation; second, to restore Russia as a productive nation; third, to find some way for the liquidation of the

debts owing us by certain of the countries of Europe in order that the European countries generally might find the exchange market so rehabilitated that they would be able to purchase raw materials and to generally bring about a restoration of their productive industry.

I was so persuaded in the first place of the necessity of the restoration of the productive power of Russia that I took my political life in my hands—and I lost it and I have no regrets—by openly advocating some action which would restore Russia as a productive nation. The restoration of Russia is a part of the general problem of European rehabilitation, and it has a direct bearing upon the amendment which I have offered; for any conference which might be called must, of course, include Germany and Russia; otherwise it would be worse than useless. It would fail as the Paris conference failed; it would fail as the Washington conference, in my judgment, failed; it would fail of removing the great economic difficulties which seem to be forcing the world inevitably to the brink of war.

Mr. WATSON. Has the Senator from Maryland offered an amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. FRANCE. I have offered an amendment to the Borah amendment.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to how I happened to become interested in the Russian question. I was not interested in the Russian question because I was particularly interested in Russia; I knew nothing about Russia, except in a most cursory way, and I had very little particular interest in the Russian people; but I was considering how we might so restore Europe that Europe would be able to meet her obligations to us and how we might be able to keep open the markets of Europe for American goods. As I began to study that question I began to realize that Russia was the key to the whole European situation and that if we allowed Russia to continue prostrate we would invite in Europe inevitable disaster.

Consider the fact that prior to the World War Russia, on an average, exported to the industrial countries of Europe 460,000,000 bushels of grain. Russia is the trunk of the tree of Europe. Even before the World War the peoples of the industrial countries of Europe generally were not overfed. Yet, I repeat, prior to the World War Russia poured into the arteries of international commerce 460,000,000 bushels of grain every year, enough to support life in the bodies of about 60,000,000 people in the industrial countries. It soon became evident to me as I studied the European question that if Russia did not export a sufficient quantity of grain to support life in those 60,000,000 people they would inevitably be brought to the verge of starvation. Certainly it seemed inevitable to me that they would become so undernourished that they would become dissatisfied with the conditions in their respective countries and revolution would be invited.

To-day Russia is not exporting and can not export to the industrial countries of Europe her normal amount of 460,000,000 bushels of grain. Not only can she not export 460,000,000 bushels of grain but she herself needs for immediate import 100,000,000 bushels of grain, making an apparent deficit in Europe of 560,000,000 bushels of grain. We know what the situation was in Europe last winter. Hundreds of thousands of people starved in Russia, and hundreds of thousands of people in Germany were undernourished and yet at that time there were, perhaps, some carry-over supplies. This winter, however, the situation will be even worse, because not only is there that apparent deficit of 560,000,000 bushels of grain but there is a deficit because of the falling off of production in the other countries outside of Russia of 275,000,000 bushels of rye and wheat, making a total deficit, apparently, of grain in Europe of more than 800,000,000 bushels, an amount equal to the total of our last wheat crop. Senators can imagine what our situation here would be if we had not raised a grain of wheat last year with all our surplus of corn and potatoes and other edibles, which in many years we do not even use.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator a question at that point?

Mr. FRANCE. I will yield to the Senator from Florida if he only wishes to ask me a question, for I am very anxious to conclude my remarks.

Mr. FLETCHER. I merely wish to ask a question. How many bushels of grain did the United States send to Russia with, I think, it was the \$10,000,000 which we appropriated for that purpose?

Mr. FRANCE. We appropriated \$20,000,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. How many bushels of grain would that purchase?

Mr. FRANCE. I think a considerable amount was expended for corn, but I have not at hand the exact figures as to the number of bushels of wheat which we exported to Russia.



Unfortunately, however—for it was really a tragic misfortune—we did not get that wheat to Russia in time for the last spring sowing, so the Russian crops this year have not been benefited by the shipment of the wheat into Russia last spring.

I repeat there is an apparent shortage in Europe of 800,000,000 bushels of grain. That, of course, is more than enough grain to supply 100,000,000 people with breadstuffs. The only redeeming feature of the terrible situation in Europe is the fact that they have produced in Europe this year an extraordinary potato crop—a billion bushels more than last year—so that they will have approximately 200,000,000 bushels of potato starch to in part make up the loss of the 800,000,000 bushels of grain so far as the starch foods are concerned; but that a destructive famine seems inevitable in Europe during the present winter can not be denied.

It is probably quite true that unless drastic steps are taken so that we can export all of our surplus foodstuffs to Europe several million—probably, putting it conservatively, 15,000,000—people will perish in Europe this winter from starvation. It is quite true, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has stated, that we have exported this year more than the usual amount of foods to Europe; I do not deny that, but the purchasing power of Europe has been so weak that even the physical demand has not created what might be called an economic demand for our grain and the price has not risen.

Not only that, but, to counterbalance the export of food, there has been a falling off of the consumption of foodstuffs in the United States due to our own industrial depression here. The mere fact that under these conditions we have exported to Europe more grain than we normally export is in itself an alarming one, for the reason that were it not for the desperate situation in Europe the Europeans would not be buying our grain in such unprecedented quantities. However, while our farmers in the West are unable to sell their grain at a price comparable to what the price should be, while they are compelled to sell their grain at far below the cost of production, indeed, while exports to Europe are not proceeding as they should, millions of people in Europe are in desperate need of all that we could supply in the way of foodstuffs.

I have been unable to get the newspapers to give any notice to this alarming situation in Europe. If I were a speculator, which I am not, I would be purchasing wheat to-day; and I am quite convinced that some of the wise ones who must know the conditions in Europe are quietly accumulating wheat at this very time, buying from the farmer at less than the cost of production and holding it in order that they may sell to Europe next spring when the price should certainly be much higher than it is now. I am in favor of a free market, of course, for grain. I do not believe that we can by law control the price of anything, but I say that if it is true that the newspapers are concealing European food conditions from the people in the interest of those who are quietly accumulating the grain, it is a crime which should not be lightly passed over if there is any way of dealing with it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what information he has that certain interests are hoarding grain?

Mr. FRANCE. I will say that the information which I have—and I have collected it simply because of my interest in this public question—certainly should be available to many of the big operators in grain, and it seems to me that if they have the information they might well be quietly accumulating grain before the price enhances. I have no criticism to make of their doing so; I am merely pointing out that it is very unfortunate that these facts should be kept from the farmers in order that this quiet accumulation of grain may go on. I will say further to the Senator from Michigan that I am not one of the Senators who believe in regulating from Washington every grain exchange, every newspaper, and every business transaction. I think that is one of the false theories of government with which some were indoctrinated during the war, much to the detriment of the country, and I am very free from that theory; but the situation seems to be as I have described it, and that the need in Europe for grain is desperate. There is an apparent deficit of 800,000,000 bushels of grain, and yet our farmers can not sell their wheat and corn for what it costs to produce them.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am very much interested in the view expressed by the Senator to the effect that we may expect a very material rise in the price of grain during the spring months. That will be gratifying information to the destitute people of the Northwest. However, I tried to follow the Senator to learn upon what basis he ventures that opinion. The people of Europe will not within that period of time improve

in their financial and economic condition, I am sure, so as to hold out the hope that they will eat more. Russia will produce no more. Is there any other element than the apparent shortage in the production throughout Europe affording hope along that line?

Mr. FRANCE. I value the Senator's opinion very highly; and I will say that I am merely expressing an opinion, and an opinion upon such a question is not, of course, compelling upon anyone.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I want to try to find out from the Senator upon what he bases his opinion, because I value his opinion.

Mr. FRANCE. I am rather persuaded that before the situation becomes too desperate in Europe the statesmen of the world will be so aroused that some means will be found to facilitate the purchase of grain. At any rate, however, it is undeniable that, in order to preserve their very lives, those Governments, over there must strain their resources to the uttermost to purchase, if necessary, as they did during the war, enough grain to keep their people sufficiently nourished so that they can be held in stable government.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is to say, the Senator thinks the situation is so desperate that relief must come.

Mr. FRANCE. It must come, in my judgment; and yet I say that it may possibly not come. I am not at all persuaded that we can cure the serious situation in which we find ourselves; there may be some ground for the pessimism which some express when they say that the situation can not be cured, but I think we should try to cure it.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. Did I understand the Senator from Maryland to say that there was a shortage of 800,000,000 bushels of grain in Europe?

Mr. FRANCE. Apparently so.

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator be so kind as to refer to his sources of information in regard to that?

Mr. FRANCE. I will say to the Senator that these calculations unfortunately must be worked out by a process of reasoning. We have not any adequate crop reports for Europe; we have no crop reports at all from Russia. I will refer the Senator to the manner in which I compiled my figures. I said that prior to the war Russia exported to the industrial countries of Europe on an average 400,000,000 bushels of grain. That quantity of grain is not now available for those industrial countries. Russia now must import 100,000,000 bushels of grain in order during the winter to sustain the lives of her people who are short of grain. There is a deficit of 500,000,000 bushels. The fairly accurate crop reports of the countries outside of Russia indicate that there is a shortage of wheat and rye of 275,000,000 bushels. Adding that to 500,000,000 makes a deficit of grains of approximately 835,000,000 bushels. Now, even if you cut that in half the situation is desperate, because 800,000,000 bushels of grain is an ample quantity of grain to support the lives of 100,000,000 people, and I have only been predicting that approximately 15,000,000 would face actual starvation in Europe the coming winter, which, I will say to the Senator, is very conservative.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator's statement that there is a shortage of 800,000,000 bushels is a startling one to me.

Mr. FRANCE. It is, I will say to the Senator; it is a very startling one.

Mr. STERLING. I would rather have a different statement than that given by the Senator, namely, that we must reach this by a process of reasoning. It seems to me that crop estimates might be furnished that would be quite reliable. I am reminded, if the Senator will permit me, of what we were urged to do during the war by the present Secretary, Mr. Hoover, the then Fuel Administrator, and of his statement as to what the shortage was or would be in Europe with the manpower of Europe so engaged in the prosecution of the war; but the Senator's figures are surely away beyond anything that was given us at that time.

Mr. FRANCE. I will say to the Senator that I presume he does not question that prior to the war Russia produced 2,600,000,000 bushels of the grains, about 1,600,000,000 bushels more of these grains than the United States produced. I presume he would not question that.

Mr. STERLING. As the Senator from Indiana suggests to my mind, what kind of grain? Was it wheat?

Mr. FRANCE. No; certainly not wheat; but I would recall to the distinguished Senator's mind that there are no wheat eaters in the world except in the United States and possibly in England. I mean to say, wheat eaters in the sense that they



support life by the use of wheat. No; I am referring, of course, to wheat, rye, barley, and oats, the staple food grains; and in such a situation as this we must, of course, take into consideration all of the food grains. Let me say to the Senator that the distinguished Senator from Idaho, I think, yesterday—perhaps it was another—presented figures showing that the world was short a billion bushels of bread grains. I am very glad that the Senator is becoming alarmed, because it is time that we became alarmed over the real food situation and less alarmed over the propaganda situation, because the worst propagandist in the world for revolution is hunger gnawing at a man's stomach.

Mr. WATSON. Do I understand my friend to say that there is a shortage of 830,000,000 bushels of wheat in Europe, or of all grains combined?

Mr. FRANCE. No; of all of the grains. The shortage of 275,000,000 bushels is the shortage of wheat and rye. That is the shortage in the countries outside of Russia. The total shortage which I said was the shortage represented by what Russia formerly exported is a shortage of wheat, rye, barley, oats, and corn.

Mr. WATSON. How much of wheat?

Mr. FRANCE. This is what Russia formerly exported—161,000,000 bushels of wheat, 34,000,000 bushels of rye, 168,000,000 bushels of barley, 65,000,000 bushels of oats, and 30,000,000 bushels of corn. I will put these figures in the RECORD. They have been put in the RECORD once before.

Mr. WATSON. Do I understand the Senator to say that the Russians are not wheat eaters?

Mr. FRANCE. Not as we are.

Mr. WATSON. Do they export all they raise?

Mr. FRANCE. Oh, no—no, indeed. I do not think it is necessary for me to put in all of the figures of the production. The total production of those grains in Russia was 2,600,000,000 bushels, as compared with our total production of the same grains of about 1,000,000,000 bushels.

Now, I appeal to the Senators. There can be no question as to the significance in my figures. I say that the alarming fact, which no other Senator here has seemed fully to realize, is that Russia—the great granary of Europe, producing normally 2,600,000,000 bushels of grain—has been practically prostrate for four years; and the inevitable result of that will be malnutrition, a great amount of starvation, and profound unrest in the industrial countries of Europe. As a matter of fact, the situation in Germany to-day, which is one bordering on revolution, has been brought about owing to the shortage of food, and I want to say that the same situation exists to a lesser degree in England itself, for many people in England are on short rations to-day because of the failure of the agricultural productive power of Russia; and I say to you, Senators, that if you really face this great Russian question you will find that there can be no rehabilitation of Europe until the agricultural productive power of Russia is rehabilitated. Russia, of course, always paid the interest on her external obligations and for her imports of manufactured goods with her exports of grains. That 460,000,000 bushels of grains exported every year by Russia went, of course, for the payment of the interest on the debt she owed the other countries, and for the payment for what she bought in the way of manufactured articles. The reason why the French are making such demands upon the Germans is that the French are deprived of income which they might be receiving from Russia, owing to the fact that Russia is not in a position to make any payments, in view of the fact that she can not export.

Mr. President, I have already referred to how this situation affects the United States. We found in 1921 that we were in a very serious condition, due to unemployment. We had between four and five millions of men unemployed, and we did not know why it was. It was very apparent that the slowing down of our industries, causing that unemployment, was due to a falling off in our export trade; and I will put into the RECORD the figures showing the falling off of our export trade in 1921 as compared with 1920. Our export trade fell off \$3,700,000,000.

That is quite a tidy sum if you stop to figure it up. That is a sum sufficient to pay 4,000,000 men \$70 a month for a year, and yet we wondered why you had unemployment and why our farmers could not sell their grains at a living price. It was due to the sudden curtailment of our export trade, and this year it is worse; and I will say, as meeting the food-export figures of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], that during that period of 1921, owing to industrial depression, our domestic consumption of wheat, according to estimates, fell off 250,000,000 bushels compared with 1920.

Mr. President, it is a source of regret to me that so few Senators seem to understand the real causes which bring about war. We hear so much talk about disarmament, and I really believe that there are Senators here who think that if we did not have navies and armies we would not have any war. That is the most absurd proposition that ever could be conceived of. We could disband every army, scrap every navy, destroy every rifle, abolish gunpowder, and still, if the economic conditions were such as to bring about war, war would come. We had wars before these great agencies of destruction were ever dreamed of, and we will have them, perhaps, if civilization shall go down into darkness, after they have been forgotten.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the truth of what the Senator has just said is proved by all history. Applying it to naval disarmament, the greatest naval battles in the history of the world, which have had more effect upon the destinies of mankind than any others, were fought long before we had any modern navies at all.

Mr. FRANCE. That is true. My fear with reference to the disarmament conference was that if Great Britain, Japan, and France—the three great remaining empires of the world—met with the United States to formulate any sort of a policy, we would naturally drive into another camp the great, the mighty nations, the mightiest nations in all the world so far as man power and natural resources are concerned—Russia, Germany, China, and the Mohammedans—creating a countercoalition. A very few weeks after I expressed that fear Russia and Germany had already struck hands in a notable treaty. The situation in Europe is such, the economic distress in Russia and Germany is such, the situation in the Near East is such, that Russia, Germany, and the Mohammedans are naturally being consolidated together under the hammers of repression and oppression into a mighty counteralliance which threatens war.

If the British deliver an ultimatum to the Turks, what will happen? Why, I heard a Senator declare here that it was safe to go into the four-power pact because Russia would not revive within the 10 years of the treaty's life. I asked him where his information on that score came from. I knew that he had no information.

I knew that the great arms conference was sitting with its eyes blinded as to what was going on in Russia, and I knew that it was making a terrible mistake; for all the Russians need to-day is artillery, and they have an army which they can put in the field that could march to Paris and could hardly be stopped. We have read in the papers within a few days that the great Krupp industry has received a concession of several hundreds of thousands of acres of land in Russia—and for what purpose? It seems to me that it is quite possible that it is in payment for artillery; and certainly the closest sort of relationships exist between Germany and Russia. It is a situation which certainly needs most careful study.

Mr. President, I have concluded what I have had in mind to say. I say that we face the most critical situation which the world has ever faced, and it is time for us to lay aside our prejudices, to discard all policies of vengeance and violence, and to seek to apply policies which will mean the reconciliation of all peoples and the rehabilitation of the productive power of the world. If we are to do that, we must have an international conference where these great questions can be discussed. What is Russia to do with reference to her former external obligations, her former debt? What is to be done about the German reparations? What is to be done about the obligations owing by the various countries to the United States? Those are the great questions which must be settled if we are to prevent a most serious situation overtaking the world.

Mr. President, I had anticipated discussing the European situation from a slightly different angle within the next few days. I am in doubt as to whether it would be helpful or harmful for me to state what I believe to be the real reason for our Russian policy. Certain it is that the whole weight of the international bankers and of the leaders of Great Britain, France, and Japan is thrown on the side of not allowing us to deal directly with Germany and Russia. The Empires have their own imperial purposes to serve, and it seems to me that we should be very careful not to be guided or influenced by their advice on these great international questions. We should formulate our own German policy and our own Russian policy. I think if the real situation behind the politics of Europe were thoroughly understood, it would mean that we would soon most radically change our general European policy, and particularly our Russian policy.



I felt that it was my duty to put some of these figures in the RECORD with reference to the European situation. Of course, if Senators feel, in view of certain unreasoning opposition here and there, that they wish to defeat this amendment, it is for them to decide. Personally, I want to see my party deal with this situation in a masterful way. I want to see a policy adopted by our party for this Republic which will mean the assertion in the world's councils of American leadership and the application of the great principles of exalted benevolence enjoined upon us by Washington, who in his farewell address said:

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence.

Mr. FRANCE subsequently said: Mr. President, during the course of my remarks yesterday I had intended to ask unanimous consent to print in connection with my remarks certain letters and resolutions substantiating what I had said. In the haste of closing the debate I neglected to do so. Therefore I now ask unanimous consent to print in connection with my remarks of yesterday letters from the Department of Agriculture and certain resolutions which bear out the statements which I made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

Figures from tables of Mr. O. B. Austin, statistician of the National City Bank of New York, showing the increase in the national debts of the world.

1793, total of national debts.....	\$2,433,250,000
1820, total of national debts.....	7,299,750,000
1850, total of national debts.....	9,000,000,000
1874, total of national debts.....	22,500,000,000
1900, total of national debts.....	31,201,759,000
1913, total of national debts.....	43,362,300,000
1918, total of national debts.....	205,396,000,000
1919, total of national debts.....	295,070,000,000
1921, total of national debts.....	400,000,000,000

National debt of United States now 10 per cent of pre-war wealth.

National debt of Great Britain now 50 per cent of pre-war wealth.

National debt of France now 73 per cent of pre-war wealth.

Austria-Hungary and Germany each now has a national debt in excess of the national wealth.

The increase in the fixed charges of the nations as the result of the increased interest payments on approximately three hundred and sixty billions of increased national debt must be in 1921 about fifteen billions of dollars, as compared with 1913.

Table showing mobilized strength and casualty losses of the belligerents.

#### UNITED STATES AND ASSOCIATED NATIONS.

Nation.	Mobilized.	Dead.	Wounded.	Prisoners or missing.	Total casualties.
United States.....	4,272,521	67,813	192,483	14,363	274,659
British Empire.....	7,500,000	692,065	2,037,325	360,367	3,089,757
France.....	7,500,000	1,385,300	2,675,000	446,300	4,506,600
Italy.....	5,500,000	460,000	947,000	1,393,000	2,800,000
Belgium.....	267,000	20,000	60,000	10,000	90,000
Russia.....	12,000,000	1,700,000	4,950,000	2,500,000	9,150,000
Japan.....	800,000	300	907	3	1,210
Rumania.....	750,000	200,000	120,000	80,000	400,000
Serbia.....	707,343	322,000	28,000	100,000	450,000
Montenegro.....	50,000	3,000	10,000	7,000	20,000
Greece.....	230,000	15,000	40,000	45,000	100,000
Portugal.....	100,000	4,000	15,000	200	10,000
Total.....	39,676,864	4,869,478	11,075,715	4,956,233	20,892,226

#### CENTRAL POWERS.

Germany.....	11,000,000	1,611,104	3,683,143	772,522	6,066,769
Austria-Hungary.....	6,500,000	800,000	3,200,000	1,211,000	5,211,000
Bulgaria.....	400,000	201,224	152,399	10,825	265,448
Turkey.....	1,600,000	300,000	570,000	130,000	1,000,000
Total.....	19,500,000	2,912,328	7,605,542	2,124,347	12,542,217
Grand total.....	59,176,864	7,781,806	18,681,257	7,080,580	33,434,443

Source: The New International Yearbook, 1918, page 761.

Mr. FRANCE. It has been claimed that the earning power of the world has been reduced by the absolute loss of 10,000,000 of men, at their most productive ages, due to deaths and serious and total disabilities. Estimating the productive power of each of these men as worth \$500 per annum there would appear to be an annual deficit of \$5,000,000,000 due to loss in man power. Adding to the \$15,000,000,000 representing the increased interest charges the \$5,000,000,000 of decreased income through loss of man power gives us a deficit of \$20,000,000,000 annually. To this must be added increased charges for the care of the disabled and for pensions for widows and orphans.

Tables showing pre-war foreign crops of principal grains as compared with crops of the United States.

#### WHEAT.

Production, yearly average, 1909-1913:	Bushels.
Russia.....	606,933,000
France.....	317,254,000
Germany.....	152,119,000
Italy.....	185,260,000
Hungary.....	156,523,000
Rumania.....	86,679,000
Austria.....	61,075,000
Bulgaria.....	43,725,000
Poland.....	23,343,000
Serbia.....	14,775,000
Belgium.....	14,583,000

Grand total production of wheat in foreign countries.....

2,779,593,000

United States production, yearly average, 1909-1913, 686,691,000 bushels.

#### OATS.

Production, yearly average, 1909-1913:	Bushels.
Russia.....	874,945,000
Germany.....	591,996,000
France.....	310,020,000
Austria.....	143,392,000
Hungary.....	85,840,000
Poland.....	76,590,000
Belgium.....	40,905,000
Italy.....	36,945,000
Rumania.....	27,545,000
Bulgaria.....	9,880,000
Serbia.....	5,443,000

Grand total production of foreign countries of oats.....

2,955,768,000

United States production, yearly average, 1909-1913, 131,175,000 bushels.

#### RYE.

Production, yearly average, 1909-1913:	Bushels.
Russia.....	815,996,000
Germany.....	445,222,000
Austria.....	112,752,000
Poland.....	90,494,000
Hungary.....	48,716,000
France.....	48,647,000
Belgium.....	22,675,000
Bulgaria.....	8,553,000
Italy.....	5,328,000
Rumania.....	4,652,000

Grand total, production of foreign countries of rye.....

1,656,627,000

United States production, yearly average 1909-1913, 34,916,000 bushels.

#### BARLEY.

Production, yearly average, 1909-1913:	Bushels.
Russia.....	384,027,000
Germany.....	153,529,000
Austria.....	71,988,000
Hungary.....	69,812,000
France.....	46,489,000
Poland.....	27,150,000
Rumania.....	24,821,000
Bulgaria.....	12,425,000
Italy.....	10,104,000
Serbia.....	5,072,000
Belgium.....	4,247,000

Grand total, production of foreign countries of barley.....

1,198,608,000

United States production, yearly average 1909-1913, 181,881,000 bushels.

#### POTATOES.

Production, yearly average, 1909-1913:	Bushels.
Germany.....	1,681,959,000
Russia.....	869,798,000
France.....	489,377,000
Austria.....	456,485,000
Poland.....	373,917,000
Hungary.....	180,163,000
Belgium.....	107,021,000
Italy.....	60,813,000
Rumania.....	3,634,000
Bulgaria.....	454,000

Grand total production, of foreign countries, potatoes.....

4,797,098,000

United States production, yearly average, 1909-1913, 356,627,000 bushels.

#### CORN.

Production, yearly average, 1909-1913:	Bushels.
Hungary.....	168,081,000
Rumania.....	100,620,000
Italy.....	100,349,000
Russia.....	56,571,000
Bulgaria.....	28,219,000
Serbia.....	28,128,000
France.....	22,229,000
Austria.....	14,536,000

Grand total production, of foreign countries, of corn.....

903,322,000

United States production, yearly average, 1909-1913, 2,708,334,000 bushels.



## BEANS.

Production, yearly average, 1909-1913:

	Bushels.
Italy.....	21,038,000
Austria.....	9,666,000
France.....	9,518,000
Hungary.....	7,516,000
Russia.....	6,027,000
Rumania.....	5,615,000
Bulgaria.....	1,895,000
Serbia.....	1,676,000
Poland.....	505,000

Grand total production, of foreign countries, of beans..... 267,295,000

United States production, yearly average, 1909-1913, 11,156,000 bushels.

Table showing the pre-war average crops of wheat, oats, rye, and barley of Russia and the United States, in bushels.  
(Production, yearly average, 1909-1913.)

	Russia.	United States.
Wheat.....	606,333,000	686,691,000
Oats.....	874,945,000	131,175,000
Rye.....	815,996,000	34,916,000
Barley.....	384,027,000	181,881,000
Total.....	2,681,901,000	1,034,663,000

Table showing the pre-war yearly average (1909-1913) export from Russia of the following cereals in bushels:

Pre-war yearly average (1909-1913) exports of cereals in bushels:	
Wheat.....	161,766,000
Rye.....	34,921,000
Barley.....	168,461,000
Oats.....	65,279,000
Corn.....	30,034,000
Total.....	460,461,000

Russia can not now export these grains to the industrial countries, but requires, it is estimated, to import 100,000,000 bushels of wheat for seed and food. Adding the loss of the grains which she formerly exported to what she requires for import would give us an apparent shortage of 560,000,000 bushels of these principal grains. In addition to this apparent shortage must be added the decrease in the production of rye and wheat in the European countries outside of Russia, as follows:

Table showing the loss of production of rye and wheat in the principal European countries in 1922 as compared with 1921, without including Russia, and the increase in the potato crop.

	1921	1922	Decrease.
Rye.....	726,812,000	670,715,000	56,097,000
Wheat.....	1,208,535,000	988,719,000	219,816,000
Total loss.....			275,913,000

I offer the following paragraphs from those memoranda giving the figures showing the loss in grains and the increase in the production of potatoes in Europe in 1922 as compared with 1921:

[Extracts from statement of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture from memoranda submitted by Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture.]

The present estimate of the rye production of Europe for all countries reporting amounts to 670,715,000 bushels as compared with 726,812,000 bushels last year, or a decrease of 56,097,000 bushels. These estimates include figures for 18 countries, and all of the principal rye producing countries have reported except Russia.

According to our last published statement the European production for 1922 was 988,719,000 bushels compared with 1,215,084,000 bushels for 1921, or a decrease of 226,365,000 bushels. This statement was published in Foreign Crops and Markets October 11, 1922, page 215, and in Weather Crops and Markets for November 18, page 449.

Since that statement was prepared revised estimates have come in from some countries for both 1922 and 1921, so the total European production for 1922 is now estimated at 988,719,000 bushels as compared with 1,208,535,000 bushels in 1921, or a decrease of 219,816,000 bushels.

The European potato production this year is estimated to be 8,260,184,000 bushels as compared with 2,192,640,000 bushels in 1921, or an increase of 1,067,544,000 bushels. These estimates do not represent the total European production since they include only 12 countries. Among the countries for which figures are not available are France, Russia, Ireland, Spain, Sweden, and Italy, which together produced an average of 1,702,265,000 bushels during the period 1909-1913. Reports on the condition of the potato crop indicate that it is good in Europe generally this year.

From what I have said it is apparent that considering the world as a whole, as made up of the great civilized nations, we may say that it is short of food and goods, disordered in its

productive power, and practically insolvent. The remedies are: The immediate calling of a general economic conference; a world-wide plan for food and seed conservation and for increased acreages next year; financial machinery so that our farmers can export at profitable prices to meet Europe's famine need; the restoration of Russia's agricultural productive power; increase of total world productivity by development of her human and natural resources; reduction of German indemnity; liquidation of the international debts, especially those owed to us by Europe; establishment of cooperation or a concert between the nations in plans for reconstruction, reconciliation, the spread of civilization, the application of equity and justice in international affairs, and permanent peace.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks the following bills and resolutions, presenting in concrete form my solution for these various problems created by the World War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY MR. FRANCE JANUARY 14, 1919, PROVIDING FOR AN IMMEDIATE PEACE, THE RETURN OF OUR TROOPS FROM EUROPE, AND THE CALLING OF A GENERAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO DEAL WITH THE POLITICAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND FINANCIAL INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS GROWING OUT OF THE WAR.

[Sixty-fifth Congress, third session.]

Senate Resolution 412.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

January 14, 1919.

Mr. FRANCE submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas on the 11th day of November, 1918, the President of the United States announced the signing of an armistice between the United States and the Central Powers, against which this Nation had been at war, the President at that time declaring "The war thus comes to an end"; and

Whereas it has not as yet come to the knowledge of the Senate of the United States that peace negotiations have been entered into with the enemy; and

Whereas the keeping for any length of time of an American Army upon European soil is undesirable and a cause of vast expense and of deep anxiety to the American people; and

Whereas profound unrest among the people of many nations and violent revolutions in several countries, which spirit of unrest and revolution are augmented by the hardships resulting from the maintenance of armies of occupation, and by that underproduction, throughout the world, of the necessities and commodities of life which has resulted from the long withholding of many millions of men from productive industry, must be a cause for deep concern on the part of the several governments: Therefore be it

Resolved, First, That the Senate, as part of the treaty-making power of the Government, does hereby consent to and most earnestly advise that at the very earliest possible moment negotiations be entered into with the enemy looking to the establishment of a just peace, and that all subsidiary questions which might delay the establishment of such a just peace between the nations, without which peace national stability is everywhere endangered, may be postponed for a later discussion at an international conference.

Second, That the Senate, as part of the treaty-making power of the Government, does hereby consent to and most earnestly advise that at the earliest possible moment consistent with the safety of this Nation American troops be returned from Europe; and, further, that after the establishment of peace the President call upon the Governments of North and South America to appoint two delegates each to an international conference, to be held at some suitable time and place, to consider plans for the closer cooperation of these Governments in promoting justice, progress, and friendship among and within the said countries of the Western Continent; and further, That the President also, at some time subsequent to this conference of the American Republics, call upon all the nations to appoint delegates to another international conference to be held at some suitable time and place to discuss and consider plans for the promotion of justice, progress, and friendship among and within the nations of the world, such conference to particularly discuss and consider plans for the removal so far as may be of the economic and social causes of war, and to this end particularly give attention to—

First. The congestion of population of some nations.

Second. The underpopulation of other nations.

Third. The unregulated competition between the more populous and industrial countries for the raw products and trade of the less populous and agricultural ones.

Fourth. The exploitation of the weaker and the less advanced by the stronger and more highly organized nations.

Fifth. A larger self-determination of peoples and nations.

Sixth. The possibility of the cooperation of the more advanced nations for the improvement of the conditions of the backward countries, particularly those of Africa and parts of Asia, by the formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste lands for the utilization of natural resources, including water powers, for wise colonization, for education, and for the spread of civilization in the interest of those countries and of the world.

Seventh. The best means for the wider and more rapid extension of education and civilization throughout the world, looking to the ultimate elimination of national, racial, and religious antagonisms.

Eighth. The establishment of constitutional republics or of governments of such uniformity throughout the world as would make for that national stability upon which could be based a permanent international order.

Ninth. The elimination of all causes of national enmities and the establishment of friendship and justice between the nations, with a view to the ultimate establishment of a league of nations or world federation of republics for the purpose of promoting the cause of progress and of peace throughout the earth.



JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE FEBRUARY 26, 1920, PROVIDING FOR THE REESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE AND THE CALLING OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO FORMULATE PLANS FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION; TO CONSIDER THE COMMON AND MUTUAL INTERESTS AND THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS OF THE STATES AND PEOPLES OF THE WORLD; TO RECOMMEND PROJECTS OF UNIFORMITY, RECIPROCITY, OR COOPERATION IN THE ACTION OF THE STATES, RESPECTIVELY; TO FORMULATE A BODY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW BASED ON THE SECURITY OF THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL AS THE PRIME FUNCTION OF ALL GOVERNMENTS, AND FOR APPLYING AS BETWEEN STATES THE ANALOGIES OF THE LAWS OF PARTNERSHIP AND COTENANCY, AND AS BETWEEN STATES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE COLONIES, PROTECTORATES, AND DEPENDENCIES THE ANALOGIES OF THE LAWS OF CONSERVATORSHIP, GUARDIANSHIP, AND TRUSTEESHIP; TO DEVISE METHODS FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE PEOPLES OF COLONIES, PROTECTORATES, OR DEPENDENCIES FROM THE STATUS OF DEPENDENCIES TO THAT OF INDEPENDENCE AND TO FULL PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES; TO PROMOTE COOPERATION AMONG THE MORE ADVANCED NATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT AND ADVANCEMENT OF THE BACKWARD COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES; TO CONSIDER THE PROBLEMS OF THE CONGESTION OF SOME AND THE UNDERPOPULATION OF OTHER NATIONS AND THE UNREGULATED COMPETITION BETWEEN THE MORE POPULOUS AND INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES FOR THE TRADE AND RAW PRODUCTS OF THE LESS POPULOUS AGRICULTURAL ONES; TO STUDY THE PROBLEM OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCE, CREDITS, AND EXCHANGE, WITH A VIEW TO THE PROMPT SHIPMENT ON SUITABLE CREDITS, PARTICULARLY INTO RUSSIA, GERMANY, AUSTRIA, CHINA, AFRICA, AND ANY OTHER AGRICULTURALLY OR INDUSTRIALLY UNDEVELOPED OR PROSTRATED COUNTRIES, OF TOOLS, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, SEEDS, AND OTHER MATERIALS NECESSARY TO PRODUCTION, AS WELL AS FOODSTUFFS, NECESSITIES, AND COMMODITIES, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENCOURAGING A RESUMPTION OF PRODUCTION WHICH WILL BE FAVORABLE TO THE REHABILITATION OF THE WORLD; TO LOCALIZE HOSTILITIES BETWEEN STATES; TO MAKE FURTHER PROVISION FOR THE PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES; TO ENCOURAGE THE ESTABLISHMENT, WHERE STABLE GOVERNMENTS DO NOT EXIST, OF CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLICS OR GOVERNMENTS OF SUCH CHARACTER AS WOULD MAKE FOR THAT NATIONAL STABILITY UPON WHICH COULD BE BASED A PERMANENTLY PEACEFUL INTERNATIONAL ORDER; TO PROMOTE AMITY AND MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE ORIENTAL AND OCCIDENTAL PEOPLES; TO CONSIDER THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS OF THE STATES AND PEOPLES OF THE WORLD AS NATURALLY AND NECESSARILY UNITED FOR MUTUAL AID AND BENEFIT; AND TO CONCERT MEASURES ACCORDINGLY.

[Sixty-sixth Congress, second session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 163.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

February 26, 1920.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) providing for the reestablishment of peace and the calling of an international conference to institute a concert of nations to advise concerning international cooperation as a substitute for the League of Nations and for a national referendum.

Whereas on the 11th day of November, 1918, the President of the United States announced the signing of an armistice between the United States and the powers with which the United States had been at war, the President at that time declaring "the war thus comes to an end"; and

Whereas it is most desirable that there shall be a prompt termination of the status of war by the formal legal reestablishment of peace between the United States and Germany; and

Whereas the peace treaty has failed to receive the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate, one of the reasons for the negative action being that more than one-third of the Senate hold that the covenant of the League of Nations incorporated in said treaty if adopted by the United States would contravene its fundamental principles as declared in the Declaration of Independence by subjecting the external relations of the United States to the control of a foreign body not recognizing these principles, would violate the Constitution by attempting to change the form of government of the United States without a constitutional amendment, and would ignore and tend to destroy the right of States under the law of nations to defend themselves and to extend civilization in behalf of all civilized nations by means of war when other means are impossible; and

Whereas there is a profound unrest throughout the world, due in large part to the failure of the Paris peace conference to formulate such plans for peace and for international cooperation for the advancement of justice, liberty, and the general welfare as would commend itself to the great liberal spirit of the age and the new enlightened conscience of mankind; and

Whereas the long-continued underproduction and rapid destruction during the war of the necessities and commodities of life, particularly of food, have resulted in a serious shortage, which makes imperatively necessary an immediate reorganization of all agricultural, industrial, financial, and commercial activities for the maximum production in all countries and for the distribution among the nations by the normal methods of trade and commerce of such food, necessities, and commodities; and

Whereas because of the close community of financial, industrial, and commercial interests of all of the nations of the world, the industrial and financial prostration and paralysis of Germany, Austria, Russia, and other recently belligerent countries of Europe, with the necessarily ensuing unemployment, impoverishment, and starvation of their citizens, with the threatened unrest and revolution in certain of these countries, are impeding the rehabilitation and are menacing the peace of the world and the stability of all government; and

Whereas, therefore, it is desirable to bring about immediately a situation of general peace and to take measures for establishing at the earliest practicable moment a form of international organization, approved by the public sentiment of the people of the United States, to deal with the social and economic problems growing out of the present war, and to bring about as nearly peaceful relations as possible between States by judicious and carefully wrought out measures of international cooperation; and

Whereas those opposing the plan of international organization contained in the covenant of the League of Nations recognize that it has now become necessary for the United States to cooperate methodically and permanently with the States and countries of the world and to take the lead in establishing a concert of nations to direct such cooperation by considered advice, but have heretofore been confined to an indirect and imperfect expression of their views by means of reservations to the said covenant proposed in the Senate; and

Whereas the question of the participation of the United States in an international organization is an issue in the approaching presidential election, and it is desirable that the plan of international organization approved by those opposing the League of Nations should be formulated so that the voters, by supporting a candidate for the office of President pledged to one or the other of the two plans, may express the public sentiment concerning the policy to be pursued by the United States respecting international organization: Now, therefore, in order to promote a general pacification, to declare the plan of international organization approved by those opposed to the plan of the League of Nations, and to make provision so that at the next national election a referendum vote may be had determining the public sentiment of the United States concerning the form of international organization which the people approve, be it

Resolved, etc., That the status of war with Germany, declared by the Congress by Senate Joint Resolution 1, on the 5th day of April, 1917, be, and it is hereby, declared to be terminated and the full status of peace be, and it is hereby, declared to be reestablished.

2. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and advised to make treaties of peace without annexations or indemnities and of trade and intercourse with the Republic of Germany, all matters of dispute between the two countries to be submitted for arbitration to The Hague tribunal.

3. That, in pursuance of this resolution declaring the reestablishment of peace, all American troops now upon foreign soil shall be immediately returned to the United States.

4. That the President is hereby authorized and directed, by invitations to be sent out by him during the month of May, 1921, to invite the States signatory of or adherent to the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, of July 24, 1899, and their successors, and all other States since recognized or which may be recognized prior to the sending out of the invitations, to send three delegates each, and also two delegates in behalf of each of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, respectively, of the various States having colonies, protectorates, or dependencies, to assemble at Washington, on a date in September, 1921, to be fixed in the invitation, to consult concerning the formation of a more perfect general concert and union, the establishment of general justice, the assurance of the general tranquility, the promotion of the general welfare, and the securing generally of the blessings of liberty to the peoples now living and to their posterity.

5. That the list of said States to be invited shall include the following: Argentine Republic, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Yugoslavia, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Persia, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Salvador, Serbia, Siam, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

6. That the invitations shall expressly state that the motive of the United States in issuing them is to initiate and bring about a concert of nations as a substitute for the League of Nations, and shall be expressly with the understandings as herein set forth, namely: There shall be an international conference of the States, composed of three delegates from each of the States, and an assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, composed of two delegates from each of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, the international conference and the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies to sit separately but at the same time. The assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall deliberate exclusively concerning social and economic measures and shall report to the international conference. The international conference and the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall be the first of a series of periodical conferences and assemblies of similar character, meeting at periods of three years at places determined by the international conferences. The general object of the conferences and assemblies shall be to constitute a concert of the States and countries of the world on the general lines of the International Conference of American States and the Inter-American High Commission, by means of central and national institutions and processes adapted to carry on orderly discussion, deliberation, and judgment concerning matters of common interest with a view to inducing such peaceful and voluntary action of the States in the common interest as may be needful to bring about international cooperation. All resolutions agreed upon either in the international conference or in the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall be of an advisory character, and any international or pan-national organs or processes initiated or instituted shall be of a voluntary nature and shall have only advisory powers. The international conferences shall establish and maintain a system of advisory correspondence, with continuation committees sitting in the intervals between the conferences to prepare for the international conferences and the assemblies of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies and to carry on the system of correspondence. The more specific objects of the international conference, of the assembly of colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, and of the continuation committees, and the purpose of the correspondence between the States participating shall be—

(a) To consider the common and mutual interests and the social and economic relations of the States and peoples of the world as naturally and necessarily united for mutual aid and benefit and to recommend such projects of uniformity or reciprocity in the action of the States, respectively, as will enable them to cooperate for the general welfare.

(b) To formulate a body of international law based on the security of the fundamental rights of the individual as the prime function of all governments and for applying as between States the analogies of the laws of partnership and cotenancy, and as between States and their respective colonies, protectorates, and dependencies the analogies of the laws of conservatorship, guardianship, and trusteeship.

(c) To devise methods for the advancement of the peoples of colonies, protectorates, or dependencies from the status of dependencies to that of independence and to full participation in the international conferences.

(d) To decide concerning the admission into the international conferences of any communities claiming to be States formed by the division of existing States or by the junction of States or parts of States.

(e) To promote cooperation among the more advanced nations for the improvement and advancement of the backward countries and territories, particularly those of Africa and parts of Asia, by the formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste land, for the utilization of natural resources, including water powers, for wise colonization, for the promotion of education and the spread of civilization throughout the world.

(f) To consider the problems of the congestion of some and the underpopulation of other nations and the unregulated competition be-



tween the more populous and industrial countries for the trade and raw products of the less populous agricultural ones.

(g) To study the problem of international finance, credits, and exchange, with a view to the prompt shipment on suitable credits, particularly into Russia, Germany, Austria, China, Africa, and any other agriculturally or industrially undeveloped or prostrated countries, of tools, agricultural implements, seeds, and other materials necessary to production, as well as foodstuffs, necessities, and commodities, for the purpose of encouraging a resumption of production which will be favorable to the rehabilitation of the world.

(h) To localize hostilities between States by cooperative policing of the high seas or otherwise and to take such action in case of such hostilities that the result of any armed conflict between States may be to increase the area within which the rights of the individual are effectively secured and to render more perfect the union of all the States for mutual aid and benefit.

(i) To make further provision for the pacific settlement of international disputes and for the settlement of such disputes according to accepted principles of law and by due process of law; and for this purpose to establish an international supreme court of justice and a system of inferior international courts having jurisdiction of controversies between States in which the parties in interest are citizens of different States, and also of such controversies between States in their own right, as may be susceptible of decision by application of accepted principles of public or private law.

(j) To encourage the establishment, where stable governments do not exist, of constitutional republics or governments of such character as would make for that national stability upon which would be based a permanently peaceful international order, and to promote the institution in each nation of appropriate national agencies of international correspondence and concert and the control by national legislatures of the appointment and instruction of national delegates to the international conferences.

(k) To promote amity and mutual understanding between the oriental and occidental peoples and to proceed with all possible means and speed to conciliate the people of Russia, China, India, Afghanistan, the Central Powers, and Turkey, in order that these nations or countries may not form against the western powers a hostile coalition which might menace the peace of the world.

7. That the functions of the United States as the initiator and host of the international conference and the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall be in the charge of a committee which shall come into existence in the month of April, 1921, and shall consist of the then Secretary of State as chairman, the then Secretary of the Treasury, the then Secretary of Commerce, two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The delegation of the United States to the international conference and to the assembly shall be nominated to the President by said organization committee and said nominees when approved by the President shall be appointed by him by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The said organization committee shall also suggest to the first international conference and to the first assembly a plan for their organization, a program of matters to be considered, a project for regulating the action of the continuation committees and a plan for organizing and regulating the central and national agencies of correspondence and concert; but nothing in the plans, project, or program so suggested shall be inconsistent with the provisions of this resolution.

8. That the general expenses of the international conference and of the assembly shall be borne by the United States, each participating State, however, paying the salaries and expenses of its own delegates and of the delegates in behalf of its colonies, protectorates, and dependencies.

9. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any sums in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the carrying out of the provisions of this resolution the sum of \$500,000.

10. That in case a candidate for the office of President, who shall have publicly announced his adherence to the plan of the League of Nations with or without reservations shall be elected at the national election in November, 1920, this act shall expire on March 4, 1921, at noon, and shall thereafter have no force or effect.

11. That the provisions of this resolution shall take effect immediately after its passage and its approval by the President.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE FEBRUARY 27, 1920, PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MORE FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA, FOR THE LIFTING OF THE EMBARGO AGAINST SHIPMENTS TO THAT COUNTRY, FOR THE EXTENSION OF TRADE AND COMMERCE WITH THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE, FOR THE ARRANGEMENT OF CREDITS, FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF ALL TROOPS OF THIS COUNTRY WHICH MAY STILL BE ON RUSSIAN SOIL, FOR ANY NEEDED EXPLANATIONS AND REPARATIONS WHICH MAY BE DUE FROM THIS COUNTRY FOR OUR INVASION OF RUSSIAN TERRITORY, FOR THE EXPRESSION OF OUR GRATITUDE TO THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE FOR THEIR HEROIC PART IN THE DEFENSE OF CIVILIZATION, OUR FELICITATIONS TO THEM FOR HAVING OVERTHROWN A DESPOTIC GOVERNMENT, AND ASSURANCES OF THE DESIRE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO COOPERATE WITH THEM AND TO ASSIST THEM IN EVERY PROPER AND POSSIBLE WAY IN THEIR EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH INSTITUTIONS WHICH WILL INSURE TO THEM AN ORDERED LIBERTY.

[Sixty-sixth Congress, second session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 164.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

February 27, 1920.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) providing for the establishment of more friendly relations with Russia, for the lifting of the embargo against shipments to that country, for the extension of trade and commerce with the Russian people, for the arrangement of credits, for the withdrawal of all troops of this country which may still be on Russian soil, for any needed explanations and reparations which may be due from this country for our invasion of Russian territory, for the expression of our gratitude to the Russian people for their heroic part in the defense of civilization, our felicitations to them for having overthrown a despotic government, and assurances of the desire of the American people to cooperate with them and to assist them in every proper and possible way in their efforts to establish institutions which will insure to them an ordered liberty.

Whereas from time immemorial there have existed, with few misunderstandings, most cordial relationships between the Governments of the United States and Russia; and

Whereas because of the devotion of the American people to free institutions, the citizens of the United States had long looked forward to the time when the people of Russia would see fit to establish such free institutions for themselves; and

Whereas during the European war the noble Russian people made heroic sacrifices, cooperating with the allied nations in the war against Germany, without which cooperation Germany might have been victorious; and

Whereas it was not because of any lack of devotion to freedom and to the cause of the Allies, but rather on account of the incompetence and corruption of their autocratic government, which failed to supply the munitions of war, that the Russian people made a separate peace with Germany; and

Whereas no unfriendly act against the United States has been committed by the Russian people but, on the contrary, the Russian people have borne with patience our unlawful invasion of their territory and intermeddling with their internal affairs; and

Whereas the people of the United States desire the continuance of friendly relations and the reestablishment of trade and commerce with the Russian people and wish, by every proper means, to assist in the rehabilitation of the industrial and agricultural activities and agencies of Russia for the sake of the Russian people, as well as for the general welfare of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, advised to communicate at once, through the Department of State, with the Government of Russia, assuring the people of Russia of our friendship, sympathy, and desire to cooperate with them and to reestablish with them full and cordial relationships of friendly intercourse, trade, and commerce; and, further, that the President be, and he is hereby, advised—

(1) To instruct the Department of State to raise the embargo against the shipment of goods to Russia;

(2) To consider and advise as to the best method of arranging credits which will make possible the shipment of such American goods as may be needed and desired by the people of Russia for the rehabilitation of their country;

(3) To immediately withdraw from Russia any and all American troops which may still be on Russian soil;

(4) To enter upon negotiations, through the Department of State, concerning any explanations or reparations which may be due from this country because of our invasion of Russian territory;

(5) To convey to the people of Russia expressions of our appreciation and gratitude for their heroic part in the war and our felicitations to them for having overthrown a despotic government, and assurances of the desire of the American people to cooperate with them and to assist them in every proper and possible way in their efforts to establish institutions which will insure to them an ordered liberty.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE APRIL 12, 1921, AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO UNDERTAKE NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE TERRITORIES IN EAST, SOUTHWEST, AND WEST AFRICA, AND IN OCEANIA, OVER WHICH GERMANY EXERCISED SOVEREIGNTY PRIOR TO THE WAR; TO UNDERTAKE NEGOTIATIONS WITH A VIEW TO ACQUIRING BY PURCHASE OR OTHERWISE THE CABLES SURRENDERED UNDER ARTICLE 244, ANNEX VII, OF THE TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY; TO ENTER UPON THE NEGOTIATION OF A TREATY OF INTERNATIONAL COMITY, COMMERCE, AND COOPERATION WITH THE ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED POWERS LOOKING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HUMAN AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF AFRICA; TO URGE THE FIXING BY THE ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED POWERS OF A JUST AND REASONABLE INDEMNITY TO BE PAID BY GERMANY TO SAID POWERS; AND TO NEGOTIATE FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL SUMS AND INTEREST THAT REPRESENT THE DEBTS NOW OWING BY THE SAID ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED POWERS TO THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

[Sixty-seventh Congress, first session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 11.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

April 12, 1921.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 11) authorizing the President of the United States to undertake negotiations for the purchase of the territories in east, southwest, and west Africa, and in Oceania, over which Germany exercised sovereignty prior to the war; to undertake negotiations with a view to acquiring by purchase or otherwise the cables surrendered under article 244, Annex VII, of the treaty of peace with Germany; to enter upon the negotiation of a treaty of international comity, commerce, and cooperation with the allied and associated powers looking to the development of the human and natural resources of Africa; to urge the fixing by the allied and associated powers of a just and reasonable indemnity to be paid by Germany to said powers; and to negotiate for the settlement of the principal sums and interest that represent the debts now owing by the said allied and associated powers to the United States, and for other purposes.

Whereas since the 11th day of November, 1918, when the President of the United States announced the signing of an armistice between the United States and the powers with which the United States had been at war, little progress has been made toward the rehabilitation of the European nations, and there are widespread financial and industrial depression, unemployment, misery, and social unrest; and

Whereas the dismemberment and bankruptcy of Austria, the disorganization and insolvency of Germany, the unfavorable conditions in Italy, the isolation of Russia from the world's trade, and the diminished purchasing power of the European countries because of the enormous debts owed by certain of the European nations to the United States have created conditions which tend to prevent the sale and shipment from the United States of the raw products and food supplies so desperately needed in Europe for the rehabilitation of industry and the feeding of starving peoples; and

Whereas a satisfactory settlement or liquidation of the huge debts and obligations growing out of the war, owed by certain countries to other countries in Europe and to the United States now seems to be necessary, if there is to be a speedy rehabilitation of industry in Europe and in the United States; and

Whereas cordial and constructive cooperation between the advanced nations for the solving of these serious financial, industrial, and international problems and for the advancement of the backward peoples and the development of the undeveloped, natural resources of the world has become a necessity; and

Whereas the submarine telegraphic cables to which Germany under the peace treaty renounced all rights, titles, and privileges in favor of the principal allied and associated powers, have become the subject of



a controversy in which the interests of the United States are vitally involved: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That the President be authorized to call and enter an international conference of the principal allied and associated powers—Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan—for the formulation of plans for the adjustment or settlement of the international debts and obligations growing out of the war, particularly the debts owed by certain of the principal allied and associated powers to the United States; that the President be further authorized to urge international policies and actions for the relief of the overburdened and bankrupt peoples by the extension of credits; that the President be authorized to promote the export trade of the United States with Europe, with Asia, and with Africa by the removal of financial and artificial barriers and restrictions; to negotiate the acquisition for the United States of the territories in east, southwest, and west Africa, and in Oceania over which Germany exercised sovereignty prior to the war; to undertake negotiations with a view to acquiring, by purchase or otherwise, from the principal allied and associated powers, the cables surrendered under article 244, Annex VII, of the treaty of peace with Germany; to enter upon negotiations looking to a treaty providing for international comity, commerce, and cooperation between the United States and the principal allied and associated powers for the purpose of the upbuilding and development of the peoples and of the natural resources of Africa, Oceania, and of the backward portions of the world; and to urge the fixing by the principal allied and associated powers of a just and reasonable indemnity to be paid by Germany to said powers.

SEC. 2. That the President, in order to arrive at a just and equitable determination and settlement of all debts growing out of the war, particularly those owed by the principal allied and associated powers, or any of them, each to the other or to the United States, be, and he is hereby, authorized to enter upon conversations and negotiations with the said principal allied and associated powers, namely, with Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan:

(a) For the determination of the extent of the debts and obligations owed by Germany to the principal allied and associated powers, the debts and obligations owed by any one of the principal allied and associated powers to any other power and those owed by the principal allied and associated powers to the United States; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized—

(b) To urge upon the principal allied and associated powers the immediate necessity for fixing the indemnity sum to be paid to the principal allied and associated powers at such an amount as can be met by Germany without an undue strain and disturbance of international financial and trade arrangements, and to recommend to and urge upon the principal allied and associated powers that such indemnity sum should be, in addition to the sums already paid by Germany in money or in kind, approximately, and not to exceed that named by the principal allied and associated powers, Great Britain and France, at the Hythe conference, tentatively, namely, the principal sum not to exceed \$15,000,000,000, or not more than \$1,000,000,000 in gold a year for 28 years, and further to urge, upon this sum, a credit to Germany of approximately \$5,000,000,000 be allowed for full, final, and unconditional cession to the said principal allied and associated powers and to the United States of the territories in Africa and Oceania which were, prior to the war, under German sovereignty, namely, Togoland, Kamerun, German East Africa, German Southwest Africa, German Samoan Islands, German Pacific Islands.

(c) To enter upon conversations and negotiations with Great Britain, France, and Italy looking to the purchase by the United States from the said powers of the colonial territories in Africa over which, prior to the war, Germany exercised sovereignty, territories with an area approximately of 1,032,280 square miles.

(d) To enter upon conversations and negotiations with the said principal allied and associated powers, including Japan, looking to the purchase by the United States of the Samoan Islands and of the islands in the Pacific over which Germany exercised sovereignty prior to the war.

(e) To enter upon conversations and negotiations with Germany and Japan for a full and unconditional release by them, or either of them, of all rights, titles, or privileges of whatever nature which they, or either of them, might claim or have in said territories or islands in the Pacific.

(f) To enter upon conversations and negotiations for the acquisition by the United States from the principal allied and associated powers, or from any of them, and from Germany any residual right which she may claim, indeed, all rights, titles, or privileges of whatever nature which they or any of them may claim or have in the submarine cables to which Germany, under article 244, Annex VII, renounced all rights, titles, or privileges to the said principal allied and associated powers.

SEC. 3. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to enter upon such conversations and negotiations looking to the purchase by the United States from the principal allied and associated powers of the said territories and of the said submarine cables, with a view to relieving the said principal allied and associated powers—Great Britain, France, and Italy—by a credit to them on the debts which they owe the United States of the amount of the purchase price which the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay by such a credit on said debts for the said territories and submarine cables, namely, a sum approximately \$5,000,000,000 and not to exceed \$6,000,000,000.

SEC. 4. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, in the event of a successful termination of the negotiations for the purchase by the United States of the said territories and submarine cables, to enter upon further negotiations looking to treaty agreements between the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and Germany for cordial international cooperation in solving the problems of Africa and for the development of the undeveloped natural resources of Africa by the formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste lands, for the utilization of the natural resources, including water power, for wise colonization, particularly by the citizens of the overcrowded countries, and for the promotion of education and civilization throughout Africa in the interests of the people of Africa and of all the nations of the world.

SEC. 5. That in the event of the failure of such conversations and negotiations to result in the acquisition by the United States, in the manner and for the sums above recited, of the territories and cables herein described, the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to negotiate for the prompt settlement, principal and interest, of the debts owed by the said principal allied and associated powers to

the United States, and, pending such settlement, to request collateral satisfactory and sufficient as security for said debts.

SEC. 6. That it is the sense of the Congress that such an agreement upon and discharge of the debts of the nations, and, in particular, the satisfaction of the claims of the United States in the manner herein proposed, would be highly promotive of the good will and economic well-being of the peoples and governments of the principal allied and associated powers and those of the other European countries, and that the United States in entering upon the conversations and negotiations, through the President, with the several governments herein named, is moved by a desire to have such adjustments made, in order that there may result an associated effort by the enlightened nations in behalf of the backward peoples of the territories affected, to the ends of human welfare and the promotion of the ideals of civilization.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE DECEMBER 15, 1921, AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO SEND A COMMISSION TO RUSSIA AND TO INVITE A RUSSIAN COMMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES TO HOLD INFORMAL CONVERSATIONS WITH THE DE FACTO GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIA FOR THE PURPOSE OF ARRIVING AT A BASIS OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA.

[Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 145.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,  
December 15, 1921.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) to authorize the President of the United States to send a commission to Russia and to invite a Russian commission to the United States, to hold informal conversations with the de facto Government of Russia for the purpose of arriving at a basis of understanding between the United States and Russia, to discuss and to negotiate all problems and differences which must be adjusted, looking to the formal recognition by the United States of the de facto Government of Russia and to the restoration of friendly international and commercial relationships between the United States and Russia.

Whereas there has been carried on in this country an insidious and misleading propaganda against the people of Russia, designed to disturb the friendly relations, which had for many years existed between the United States and Russia, and to alienate the people of these two countries from each other; and

Whereas the alienation of the people of the United States from the people of Russia and the deprivation of our farmers, cotton planters, woolgrowers, manufacturers, and exporters of the great Russian markets for raw products and manufactured goods are working great hardship to them and are redounding to the great advantage of the producers, manufacturers, and exporters of other countries; and

Whereas our farmers and planters are suffering an acute distress while millions in Russia must starve, and we have millions of workers unemployed because of the industrial depression while Russia requires shoes, clothing, machinery, agricultural implements, tractors, railway supplies and equipment, and all kinds of manufactured goods and articles in unprecedented quantities; and

Whereas from motives of self-interest, as well as for the sake of humanity, we must desire to enjoy the advantages of the Russian markets, to share in the rehabilitation and development of Russia, to secure mutual understanding and friendly cooperation between the United States and Russia; and

Whereas several of the nations of Europe, including Great Britain, have already invited to their countries commissions from Russia and have sent to and now have in Russia trade delegations, while the United States has, to the disadvantage of the people of the United States, refused to hold negotiations with the Russians, maintaining the indefensible policy adopted at Paris and practically abandoned by all other nations, of isolating Russia for the purposes of punishment and coercion from commerce and intercourse with the world; and

Whereas there is a widespread demand throughout the United States for such a change in our governmental policy toward Russia as will enable the people of the United States to obtain correct information as to conditions in Russia, to participate in the great advantages of the Russian markets, and to enjoy the benefits of cordial international and commercial relationships with the people of Russia: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to select, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, seven prominent citizens of the United States, one of whom shall be experienced in international relationships and diplomacy, one to be a farmer representing our agricultural interests, one to be a member of and representing organized labor, one to be a manufacturer and representing industry, one to be a banker, financier, or political economist, and two to be representatives of the general interests of the United States at large, all of whom shall constitute a commission to visit Russia for the purpose of investigating and making report upon the problem of the restoration of normal and peaceful relationships between the United States and Russia; and

That this commission of seven members may be authorized by the President, in his discretion, to employ clerical assistants, expert accountants, political economists, interpreters, legal counsel, and such other assistants for the purpose of carrying on its work as the commission may deem necessary: *Provided*, That no member of this commission shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of \$6,000 a year and actual traveling expenses while in the United States and actual traveling and living expenses while absent on official business from the United States, and that no employee of this commission shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of \$5,000 a year, together with actual traveling expenses in the United States and actual traveling and living expenses outside of the United States when on the official business of the commission.

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to send this commission at the earliest opportunity to Russia, if this shall be agreeable to the de facto Government of Russia, for the purpose of holding conversations and carrying on negotiations in Russia with the de facto Government of Russia for the purpose of establishing a basis of mutual understanding and cooperation between the two countries, for the purpose of settlement of all differences which may exist between them, and the adjustment of all claims which either of these Governments or its citizens may assert or have against the other, and for the bringing



about of conditions which will make possible the resumption of cordial international and commercial relationships between the two countries.

That the President be authorized to particularly direct the commission, if the de facto Government of Russia shall so desire, to extend to the Russian Government such advice and assistance in the formulation of such plans for the stabilizing of the Russian currency, for the economic restoration of Russia, and for the solution of the problems growing out of the revolution as would tend to restore mutual confidence and understanding between the two countries.

That the President be authorized to direct the commission to discuss with the de facto Government of Russia and to carry on negotiations concerning the recognition and refunding by the present de facto Government of Russia of Russia's proper share of the debts and obligations of Russia outstanding, particularly the obligations of the old Imperial Government, and concerning the proper proportion of such old Imperial debt outstanding which should be borne by the present Government of Russia and the proportion to be borne by the countries constituting the territories disannexed from Russia by the powers in the peace settlement.

That the President be authorized to direct the commission to discuss all other matters which must be considered and adjusted looking to the bringing about of friendly relationships, and to charge it with the general duty of securing the most complete information possible, to be reported to the President and to the Congress and to the people of the United States concerning the attitude, the conditions, and the circumstances of the Russian people, and the purposes toward the United States of the de facto Government of Russia.

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to submit to the Congress from time to time, as he may obtain it, information from this commission as to conditions in Russia, with a view to the earliest possible recognition by our Government of the de facto Government of Russia.

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to invite the de facto Government of Russia to send a commission of seven members here to discuss with our producers and exporters the question of trade with Russia, and to negotiate with our Government all those questions which our commission to Russia shall be authorized to discuss with the de facto Government of Russia, and such other matters as the President may deem best to discuss with such commission.

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not heretofore appropriated, the sum of \$200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the expenses and salaries of the commission and of its employees and for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE DECEMBER 22, 1921, AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO CALL AN INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE FOR THE DISCUSSION OF THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND QUESTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCE, PARTICULARLY THE PROBLEM CREATED BY THE OUTSTANDING OBLIGATIONS BETWEEN CERTAIN OF THE NATIONS, AS THE RESULT OF THE WORLD WAR.

[Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 150.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,  
December 12, 1921.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 150) authorizing the President to call an international economic conference for the discussion of the economic problems and questions of international finance, particularly the problem created by the outstanding obligations between certain of the nations as the result of the World War.

Whereas there are grave economic and financial problems which have grown out of the war, and which must be solved before there can be a return to normal international, financial, and commercial relationships, and a reasonable basis for a permanent peace; and

Whereas serious disturbances of the exchange markets presenting insuperable barriers to the normal process of trade are due to the huge debts owing by certain of the nations of Europe to the other nations, and the question of the terms upon which there may be a liquidation of these debts is an international question involving the interests of all nations; and

Whereas because of the close community of financial, industrial, and commercial interests of all the nations of the world there can not be secured any cooperation for the solution of these common economic problems without an international economic conference: Therefore be it hereby

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President is hereby authorized and directed, by invitations to be sent out by him during the month of January, 1922, to invite the States signatory of or adherent to the convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes of July 24, 1899, and their successors, and all other States since recognized, or which may be recognized prior to the sending out of invitations, to send three delegates each, and also two delegates in behalf of each of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, respectively, of the various States having colonies, protectorates, or dependencies, to assemble at Washington, on a date in March, 1922, to be fixed in the invitation, to consult concerning the formation of a more perfect general concert for the establishment of general justice, the assurance of the general tranquillity, the promotion of the general welfare, and the securing generally of the blessings of liberty to the peoples now living and to their posterity and the solution of the grave economic and financial problems growing out of the war.

That the list of said States to be invited shall include the following: Argentine Republic, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Persia, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Salvador, Serbia, Siam, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

That the invitations shall expressly state that the motive of the United States in issuing them is to initiate and bring about a concert of action between the nations for the common solution for the general welfare of the grave financial, economic, industrial, and commercial international problems growing out of the war.

That there shall be appropriated, out of any sums in the Treasury not heretofore appropriated, the sum of \$100,000 for the carrying out of the provisions of this act.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE MARCH 9, 1922, AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO SEND A COMMISSION TO RUSSIA AND TO INVITE A RUSSIAN COMMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES TO HOLD INFORMAL CONVERSATIONS WITH THE DE FACTO GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIA FOR THE PURPOSE OF ARRIVING AT A BASIS OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA.

[Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 177.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,  
March 9 (calendar day, March 14), 1922.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 177) to authorize the President of the United States to send a commission to Russia and to invite a Russian commission to the United States to hold informal conversations with the de facto government of Russia for the purpose of arriving at a basis of understanding between the United States and Russia.

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to select, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, seven prominent citizens of the United States, who shall constitute a commission to visit Russia for the purpose of investigating and making report upon the problem of the restoration of normal and peaceful relationships between the United States and Russia; and

That this commission of seven members may be authorized by the President, in his discretion, to employ clerical assistants, expert accountants, political economists, interpreters, legal counsel, and such other assistants for the purpose of carrying on its work as the commission may deem necessary: *Provided,* That no member of this commission shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of \$6,000 a year and actual traveling expenses while in the United States and actual traveling and living expenses while absent on official business from the United States, and that no employee of this commission shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of \$5,000 a year, together with actual traveling expenses in the United States and actual traveling and living expenses outside of the United States, when on the official business of the commission.

That the President be authorized to direct the commission to discuss all other matters which must be considered and adjusted, looking to the bringing about of friendly relationships, and to charge it with the general duty of securing the most complete information possible, to be reported to the President and to the Congress and to the people of the United States concerning the attitude, the conditions, and the circumstances of the Russian people, and the purposes toward the United States of the de facto government of Russia.

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to submit to the Congress from time to time, as he may obtain it, information from this commission as to conditions in Russia, with a view to the earliest possible recognition by our Government of the de facto government of Russia.

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to invite the de facto government of Russia to send a commission of seven members here to discuss with our producers and exporters the question of trade with Russia, and to negotiate with our Government all those questions which our commission to Russia shall be authorized to discuss with the de facto government of Russia, and such other matters as the President may deem best to discuss with such commission.

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not heretofore appropriated, the sum of \$200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the expenses and salaries of the commission and of its employees and for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

A BILL INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE MAY 6, 1920, AMENDING THE WAR FINANCE CORPORATION ACT IN ORDER THAT THERE MIGHT BE A SECURED CREDIT TO GERMANY OF \$250,000,000 IN ORDER THAT GERMANY MIGHT PURCHASE FOODSTUFFS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

[Sixty-sixth Congress, second session.]

(S. 4341.)

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,  
May 6, 1920.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance:

A bill (S. 4341) to amend the War Finance Corporation act.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the War Finance Corporation act is hereby amended by adding to Title I thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) That the corporation shall be empowered and authorized to pay to any person, firm, corporation, or association engaged in business in the United States the contract price of supplies of food and raw materials hereafter purchased, or agreed to be purchased, by the German Government from any such person, firm, corporation, or association, and to accept, in full payment of the moneys so advanced, the bonds, obligations, or other evidence of indebtedness to be issued by Germany for the payment of the moneys so advanced, to bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date of such advance: *Provided,* That the said contract shall be approved by the corporation as to price, quantity, and subject matter; that the said contract shall be for such supplies of food and raw materials as may be judged by the Governments of the principal allied and associated powers, parties to the treaty of peace between the said powers and Germany, to be essential to enable Germany to meet her obligation for reparation under the said treaty; and that the said bonds, obligations, or undertakings by Germany shall be a first charge on all the assets and revenues of the German Empire and its constituent States, and shall be paid in priority to all other bonds, obligations, and undertakings of Germany except such as may be issued for the payment of the costs and expenses of the armies of occupation subsequent to the armistice of November 11, 1918.

"(b) The total advances to be made by the corporation shall not exceed \$250,000,000.

"(c) The terms of payment of the said bonds, obligations, or undertakings, the conditions of priority, and the assets and revenues of Germany, against which the said bonds, obligations, or undertakings shall be a charge, shall be fixed and established by the Reparation Commission appointed under and pursuant to the said treaty, subject to the approval of the corporation.

"(d) Any such bond, obligation, or undertaking shall provide that the payment thereof shall be a lien and charge against the property of Germany or of any of her nationals in the custody of the Alien Property



Custodian after the payment of debts due to the nationals of the United States.

"(e) There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$250,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of making payments by the said corporation as and when required under the provisions of this section."

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Is the Senator from Utah ready to go ahead now?

Mr. KING. No; but I think after a conference with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] we will be able to expedite the consideration of several amendments we have to offer.

Mr. McKellar. I understand the consideration of the bill will go over until to-morrow?

Mr. POINDEXTER. As to the matter the Senator from Tennessee spoke to me about, that was my understanding, but I thought perhaps if the Senator from Utah has some other matter to present he might be ready to go ahead with it this afternoon.

Mr. KING. I have one or two amendments I have not put in shape yet, but I assure the Senator that in the presentation of all the amendments I shall occupy not to exceed half an hour.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In view of that I shall move an executive session.

Mr. KING. Very well.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously made, until to-morrow, Friday, December 29, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate December 28 (legislative day of December 27), 1922.*

PRESIDING JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS APPEALS.

George Ewing Martin, of Ohio, to be presiding judge of the United States Court of Customs Appeals, vice Marion De Vries, resigned.

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES.

Marcus B. Campbell, of New York, to be United States district judge, eastern district of New York (an additional position created by the act approved September 14, 1922).

Henry W. Goddard, of New York, to be United States district judge, southern district of New York (an additional position created by the act approved September 14, 1922).

Francis A. Winslow, of New York, to be United States district judge, southern district of New York (an additional position created by the act approved September 14, 1922).

#### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Harry C. Whitehill, of Waterbury, Vt., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt., in place of Herbert C. Comings, resigned.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 28 (legislative day of December 27), 1922.*

#### POSTMASTERS.

##### ILLINOIS.

Harry J. Glover, Albion.  
Thomas Turigliatto, Benid.  
Pearl W. Norman, Galatia.  
Lyman S. Graves, Wyoming.

##### INDIANA.

Wade Denney, Farmersburg.  
Reuben Hess, Kentland.  
Edna M. McDermott, New Point.  
John S. Lightcap, North Judson.  
Rex Hannum, Worthington.

##### IOWA.

Dennis L. McDonnell, Bernard.  
Bertha Zadow, Blencoe.  
John F. Schoof, Denver.  
William W. Andrew, Dexter.  
Ben W. Stearns, Logan.

##### KANSAS.

Horace A. Fink, Russell.  
Dell D. Jackson, Winona.

##### NEW HAMPSHIRE.

George L. Crockett, Whitefield.

##### NEW JERSEY.

Dorothy H. Miller, Essex Fells.  
Thomas F. Zettlemoyer, Sewaren.  
George W. Earl, Tabor.

##### NEW YORK.

Jennie E. Carroll, Cuylerville.  
Henry C. Almy, Friendship.  
William D. Carpenter, Hagaman.  
George W. Van Hynning, Hoosick Falls.  
Thomas W. Hamer, Lacona.  
Rhoda E. Jackson, Wantagh.

##### PENNSYLVANIA.

John T. Ritter, Carnegie.  
Daniel A. Strayer, Coalport.  
Isaac W. Edgar, Glenshaw.  
Carey W. Huff, James City.  
Clarence F. Ellis, Jamestown.  
William N. Jones, Johnsonburg.  
William J. Winner, Sandy Lake.  
Joseph L. Roberts, Sharon.  
Franklin Clary, Sharpsville.  
Joseph C. Scowden, Tionesta.  
John M. Graham, Volant.  
Sara B. Coulter, Wampum.  
Harry V. Gibson, West Middlesex.  
William A. McMahan, West Pittsburg.

##### VERMONT.

John H. Dimond, Manchester Center.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 28, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art still going on with life. Unto us may it mean something intensely. Help us to meet the claims that conform to Thy holy will and to ever feel the constraints that are upon us. Giver of life, take our lives, so often misused and contradictory, and restore, renew, and simplify them and give us strength to use them better. Continue to work through us Thy great purposes which Thou hast for the good of our country. Teach us that our love and faith are tested by what we are willing to suffer and sacrifice and that these are the graces that bring us to the Father of us all. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SLEMP, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a bill (H. R. 13593) making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, which, with the report thereon (Rept. 1318), was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I reserve all points of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado reserves all points of order on the bill.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the judicial review of legislative procedure.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the judicial review of legislative procedure. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, it is proposed by constitutional amendment to take from the Supreme Court the power of judicial review of legislative enactment.

It is further proposed that congressional enactments may be reviewed by the court, but if declared a violation of the Constitution by the court, then Congress may by subsequent enactment replace the law upon the statute books and further court review be restrained.

Which means that if the court in review holds the law to be good and not a violation of the Constitution it becomes a law.

If the court holds the law is bad because it violates the Constitution, then Congress can make it good by the simple process of reenactment.

If Congress passes a good law once, it is to remain, but in order to make a bad or unconstitutional law constitutional it will be required to do the bad thing twice, and by this repetition bad law becomes as good as good law.

If Congress strikes the Constitution only one blow with one fist, it will be called a draw; but if Congress comes back and hits the Constitution a second blow with the other fist, Congress wins.

#### DISCUSSION NECESSARY.

The destruction of \$300,000,000,000 in property and 30,000,000 in lives has shaken the whole world to its very foundation, and a certain unsettling influence in our country has produced an unusual increase in crime, accompanied by assaults upon our form of government and its Constitution.

These assaults upon our Government can only be stopped by a statement of its fundamental objects and a repeated and reiterated defense of its form, by an explanation of its machinery.

This was not necessary 20 years ago but is necessary to-day, for the study of the Constitution is now neglected and our Bill of Rights is assailed in official life and by secret organizations of a political character.

The official violation of the express prohibitions contained in our Bill of Rights will find its gradual correction by the courts.

The lawless methods of the secret organization will, because of its lawlessness, be destroyed by enlightened public sentiment and criminal prosecution.

The propaganda designed to destroy our system of government must be met by discussion and answer.

The effective way to counteract these assaults is by a simple statement of our system of government and explanation of how it functions.

To restore mental poise, at least political optimism, the advantages of our form of government should be stated.

And while discussing its wisdom, its series of checks and balances, point the way to change by the orderly and intelligent use of the ballot.

Only an imperfect understanding exists of the division of power between the legislative, executive, and judicial.

We understand how to apply the ballot to change an offensive Executive, and that a legislator may be removed and another more acceptable be selected.

#### JUDICIAL POWER NOT UNDERSTOOD.

But the place of judicial power in our National Government is not understood; there seems some mystery about it; and when it is assailed, some may carelessly and without examination agree with its critics.

There have been revolts against the Executive, and we are accustomed to a discussion of this office at all times, and every four years in national elections the personality of the President, in the press and on the rostrum, is subjected to the severest test of public acclaim or disapproval.

Every two years we have a political campaign in which candidates of the various State legislatures, Congress, and the United States Senate are analyzed, respective political platforms discussed, and the issues are understood by the voter who gives thought to the subject.

But with the third great power, which comes by appointment of the Executive—the President—with the consent and approval of the legislative—the Senate—he is not familiar and leaves its discussion to the lawyer or trained educator.

First. We must understand that the judicial power of the Government is created by the joint act of both the executive and legislative branches, and then upon its creation it becomes a check upon both of the branches which created it.

Second. That while Supreme Judges are appointed for life, the legislative branch—the House and Senate—may remove by impeachment.

Third. That the Executive—the President—may be punished for an unwise selection by a subsequent defeat administered by the electorate.

Fourth. That during the nearly century and a half of our national history no scandal and but little criticism has been honestly directed against either the integrity or ability of the members of our Supreme Court.

Not since the early years of our national life, when all its machinery was rough and its detailed powers uncertain, has there been open or organized effort made to take from the judicial power the right of review of legislative enactment.

There have been criticisms of decision, and naturally in each trial there have been two sides to each controversy presented for determination, and no single judgment could be entirely satisfactory to both, and there has followed dissent and disappointment.

But in all these years until now there has been no political movement to destroy the power itself.

#### ITS REMOVAL WOULD DESTROY.

To destroy, by constitutional amendment, one of the three coordinate and foundation branches of our Government means the destruction of the present American form of government and the setting up of an entirely new and different system.

It would remove the balance of power between the executive and the legislative.

It would destroy the judicial check upon both.

It would either increase the power of the executive and lead the way to monarchy or increase power of the legislative and destroy the force of the executive.

It would take from the American plan of government its marked difference from that of any other nation which preceded its formation.

It would destroy all those interpretations of our laws which have developed with our progress and civilization and have become in effect new laws.

It would involve the rewriting of thousands of laws by both State and National Governments.

It would destroy the arbiter which decides disputes between States and citizens of States.

It would leave our Bill of Rights, so essential to personal liberty, without special official defender.

It would destroy the heart of the Constitution because it would kill the defender of the Constitution and leave 110,000,000 people subject to the intemperate, hasty, or arbitrary act of the two remaining branches of our Government.

It would remove all protection for the right of the minority.

It would place unlicensed and unlimited power in the hands of a majority.

It would destroy the written defense of individual liberty, because there would be no power to defend our written guaranties.

It would take away the balance wheel which causes the affairs of government to run smoothly and methodically.

It would destroy our dual form of sovereignty.

It would be a crowning victory for the advocates of government by mobs.

It would take from the Government its fine conscience to judicially determine right from wrong by a solemn tribunal which, unswayed by partisan heat or temporary excitement, punishes or rewards without impulse created by passion or prejudice.

It would destroy our sane plan of checks and balances.

It would disturb, unsettle, and make uncertain all the relations between men as individuals; it would make uncertain the relations between States; it would endanger the sanctity of contract; it would create for a period distrust and disputes which would destroy our national equilibrium and cause agricultural, labor, commercial, and industrial chaos.

Various persons in official life and at least two national conventions called to form new political parties advocate the destruction of the court by abolishing the power of judicial review.

This would take from the Supreme Court the power to uphold the Constitution and, by decision, to prevent its violation.

This would create, as a natural consequence, a change not only of the Constitution of the United States but of the constitutions of each of the 48 States comprising our national Union.

It would mean the rewriting of all the laws of the Nation and all the laws of each State in the Nation.

It would strike at the very vitals of our Government and, upon its ruins, would substitute anarchy for order, passion for moderation, and mob rule for judicial decree.



## CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.

The Congress and the legislatures of the various States are at least partly to blame for this new movement.

Each Member of Congress and each member of the State legislature takes oath and with uplifted right hand solemnly swears before God to uphold and defend the Constitution.

And frequently within a week's time he votes for a bill which he knows at the time, or upon investigation could ascertain, is in violation of the Constitution and which the Supreme Court, acting under their oaths of office to "uphold and defend the Constitution," must in turn declare to be void.

The Member knew the bill was unconstitutional, but he calmly removes all blame from himself, places the full failure upon the court, smiles upon his constituent, secures his support, and awaits with calm indifference the howl of rage and disappointment which follow the court's unpopular decision.

In former years the question of a measure's constitutionality was given consideration and Members listened with attention to a discussion of its legality.

To-day time for such discussion is limited by the Rules Committee of the House, and, in the brief allotment accorded Members, it is almost impossible to discuss the subject.

An adverse court decision on a measure of great public interest is followed by denunciation of the ruling by the thoughtless, and finally, in organized form, comes a demand that Congress may pass any law without review or check by an impartial tribunal.

There are, naturally, some close questions upon which even the court divides, and many important decisions are by a mere majority of the court.

Time given to the discussion of the constitutionality of a law would benefit the public and afford at least a measure of protection for one of the three coordinate branches of our Government which can not publicly defend itself.

## JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Briefly, without legal precision and omitting all reference to other powers of the Supreme Court, it will be found its power of review rests upon common sense.

In unanswerable logic, one of the framers of the Constitution said:

There is no position which depends on clearer principles than that every act of a delegated authority, contrary to the tenor of the commission under which it is exercised, is void. No legislative act, therefore, contrary to the Constitution, can be valid. \* \* \*

The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar provision of the courts. A constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges, as a fundamental law.

It therefore belongs to them to ascertain its meaning, as well as the meaning of any particular act proceeding from the legislative body.

If there should happen to be an irreconcilable variance between the two, that which has the superior obligation and validity ought, of course, to be preferred; or, in other words, the Constitution ought to be preferred to the statute, the intention of the people to the intention of its agents.

Our Constitution, it must be remembered, not only grants authority to govern but just as expressly limits such authority.

John Marshall could not stop criticism, but he confounded objection in two sentences:

To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limits may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained.

If the former part of the alternative be true, then a legislative act contrary to the Constitution is not law; if the latter part be true, then written constitutions are absurd attempts on the part of the people to limit a power in its own nature illimitable.

While the lesser power, a Congress—with but two years' life—can not override a greater power, the Constitution, with its history of nearly a century and a half, the Supreme Court always gives the benefit of doubt to Congress—in declaring its acts constitutional and must be clearly convinced of an act's unconstitutionality before it will so decide, and this is the rule of State supreme courts.

It may be said courts lean toward legislative enactment rather than away from it.

## THINGS CONGRESS CAN NOT DO.

There are certain individual rights the Constitution demands that Congress must not destroy.

If court review is abolished, then Congress can in any one session take away these rights:

(1) Religious liberty; (2) freedom of speech; (3) freedom of the press; (4) the right of peaceful assembly; (5) the right of petition for redress of grievances.

(6) The right of State militia to bear arms.

(7) No soldier shall be quartered in time of peace in a house without consent of the owner.

(8) Unreasonable search and seizure.

(9) No arrest except upon probable cause (10) supported by oath or affirmation (11) describing the place (12) and the persons or things to be seized.

(13) Capital offenses must be found by a grand jury indictment.

(14) No person shall for the same offense be twice put in jeopardy, (15) compelled to testify against himself, (16) nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; (17) no private property taken for public use without just compensation.

(18) In criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy a speedy (19) and public trial (20) by an impartial jury (21) in the district wherein the crime is committed; (22) to be informed of the nature of the accusation; (23) to be confronted by witnesses; (24) to have compulsory service for obtaining witnesses (25) and the assistance of counsel for his defense; (26) the right of trial by jury where the sum exceeds \$20.

(27) Excessive bail shall not be required (28) nor excessive fines imposed (29) nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

These rights are now all guarded by the Supreme Court, and its decrees have so far been enforced by mere announcement and notice given by its marshal.

But back of its decree and marshal is the respect of the Nation, which means the whole power of Army and Navy should necessity require.

The average man and woman finds in these provisions their greatest protection against abuse and tyranny; they are now written so all may understand and not subject to change by the whim or caprice of a passing Congress.

## CHANGES.

The Constitution is a very simple human document, written in plain language, that contains only 4,000 words of 89 sentences, and can be read aloud in 23 minutes.

We should amend our statute law to meet the requirements of a changing and complex civilization, but in making changes the fundamentals of government and the balance of powers should be preserved.

In interpreting our statutes and in passing upon their constitutionality an immense amount of law has been written, now consisting of over 250 volumes. The abolishment of judicial review would destroy this immense storehouse of legal interpretation and place upon an unskilled Congress a work of staggering magnitude.

History has the habit of repeating itself, but it is doubtful if we could to-day produce men capable of satisfactorily changing our form of government.

The old framers had just been purified in a long, bloody struggle for human liberty. They had all the necessary guideposts of history for review. They were singularly free from sordid motive. Their work has brought approval from the great thinkers of all nations, and it should not be changed in form without weighty reasons, and then at a period better suited for constructive reflection.

## INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] will please resume the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13559, the Interior Department appropriation bill, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose yesterday there was pending a point of order made by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] against the provisos in the pending paragraph for Indian school and agency buildings, on page 24, the first proviso beginning on line 11. I would like, if agreeable to the gentleman from California, for the convenience of the Chair as well as my own, to have the gentleman designate the particular portion of the language to which he takes exception rather than require the committee to justify all three provisos.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, maybe the gentleman might expedite the matter by explaining the particular part of the first proviso as to bridges and roads. It might relate to re-



serves. Bridges might be indefinite as to amount and location. Clearly there would be no right and authority to construct bridges outside of the reservations. As to the second proviso, I will not make any question on that. I believe it ought not to be there in that shape, but I believe the committee has power on that.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman does not object to the second proviso?

Mr. RAKER. No; I do not.

Mr. CRAMTON. He objects to the first proviso on the ground that the money might be used outside the reservation?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. To the second he does not object?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. CRAMTON. Now, as to the third proviso—

Mr. RAKER. I believe the gentleman will concede that that changes existing law.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman will not concede that. He will concede that it is legislation, but it is already permanent law and is unnecessary, and I am willing to have that taken out.

Mr. RAKER. All right.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will agree with the gentleman to offer an amendment striking out the third proviso.

That leaves only the question of the first proviso, and as to that the gentleman waives any objection to it so far as it relates to work upon reservations. The language of the item, Mr. Chairman, is "construction or repair work of roads and bridges and on school and agency buildings"; "including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith." The proviso in question is that this appropriation for the purposes stated "shall be available for the payment of salaries and expenses of persons employed in the supervision of construction or repair work of roads and bridges and on school and agency buildings in the Indian Service."

It is my understanding that this item has to do only with such construction or repair work on roads and bridges as is upon the reservations and in connection with the institutions. For that, of course, there is ample authority, and to that the gentleman has no objection. Apart from the point of order, if the language is uncertain as to that, if it does leave it open for construction of roads not upon reservations, I think the committee would not object to an amendment that would make it clear.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CARTER. It does not seem, Mr. Chairman, that there is any ambiguity about that language. It provides for repair work on roads and bridges. That is certainly within existing law. Those contemplated must be on the reservation. I agree with the gentleman in charge of the bill that if there is any doubt about it, I myself would like to see it fixed so that the money must be spent within the limits of the reservation. But I do not believe it is necessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, to obviate delay in a discussion that is not necessary, I will also agree to offer an amendment to insert after the word "bridges," in line 14, the words "on Indian reservations." The only question in my mind as to that is whether the word "reservations" is broad enough to include lands that might be used in connection with schools, and so forth.

Mr. RAKER. The language is peculiar—"roads and bridges, schools and agency buildings." But on the gentleman's statement as to that proviso and the last one I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. We will get to it. The point of order being withdrawn, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the last proviso, beginning on line 21, be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 24, line 21, strike out the colon and insert a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. HAYDEN. How will it read then, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CRAMTON. I propose only to strike out the last proviso. I will say to the gentleman I am advised it is already permanent law and unnecessary to be carried any longer.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the gentleman expect to add the words "on the Indian reservations"?

Mr. CRAMTON. I expect to do that later. This is on striking out the third proviso. The further pending amend-

ment is to strike out the third proviso. I will offer the other later.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment at the end of line 14. After the word "bridges" insert "on Indian reservations and other lands devoted to the Indian Service." I think that will meet the wishes of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 24, line 14, after the word "bridges" insert the words "on Indian reservations and other lands devoted to the Indian Service."

So that as amended the proviso will read:

*Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of salaries and expenses of persons employed in the supervision of construction or repair work of roads and bridges on Indian reservations and other lands devoted to the Indian Service and on school and agency buildings in the Indian Service.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, while I do not now think of any contingency which may arise, yet it is entirely possible that where there is a nonreservation Indian school located away from the Indian country it might be necessary to build a bridge to get to it.

Mr. CARTER. This would cover that, "other lands devoted to the Indian Service."

Mr. HAYDEN. But suppose a bridge had to be built off from the school ground in order to get to the school?

Mr. CARTER. This would not cover that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not understand that the appropriation is now used for any such purpose. I think wherever that happens there is specific language in the bill authorizing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INDIAN SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION.

For collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian and public schools, and for placing school pupils, with the consent of their parents, under the care and control of white families qualified to give them moral, industrial, and educational training, \$90,000: *Provided*, That not exceeding \$5,000 of this sum may be used for obtaining remunerative employment for Indian youths and, when necessary, for payment of transportation and other expenses to their places of employment: *Provided further*, That where practicable the transportation and expenses of pupils shall be refunded and shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid. The provisions of this section shall also apply to native Indian pupils of school age under 21 years of age brought from Alaska.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that this is another general appropriation of \$90,000, a \$5,000 increase over last year, providing for the collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian and public schools, and so forth.

Yesterday I tried to make clear the proposition that it would be a businesslike policy if these different amounts were so itemized that we could show the exact amount spent for each reservation and each school. My friend from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and myself had some controversy over that, he taking the position that the school appropriation could not be spent for any other purpose. I quoted a statement in the hearings before the investigation commission, printed this morning on page 976 of the Record, in which Mr. Meritt, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, stated to the committee that the money could be used for relieving distress, and so forth.

Mr. CARTER. What money?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The support of schools money.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is mistaken about that, according to his own quotation from the testimony.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I want to call attention to the statement made by Mr. Meritt in which he said:

We have no fund that is known as the general administrative item. These items are particularized for school support. For example, we could use a part of the lump-sum appropriation for school support in maintaining schools on that reservation; we could use part of the appropriation for relieving distress, for maintaining physicians on that reservation. We could use part of the appropriation for the farmers in paying the salary of a farmer on that reservation.

Now, I want to go just a little further and quote from page 356, volume 1, of the hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs in the Sixty-sixth Congress on the condition of various tribes of Indians. The gentleman will remember that Congress appropriated \$15,000 and directed that committee to investigate the Indian Bureau. They spent the \$15,000, and I am afraid very little beneficial results have come from that



investigation, although we sat day after day for two years in an effort to get to the bottom of this very involved and complicated system. But here is a question I asked Mr. Meritt at that time, on page 356 of the hearings:

Mr. KELLY. I was just trying to bring out the principle when I used that illustration. There are other instances through the bill that I have noticed, and I want to get information as to why the system grows up by which there are large lump-sum appropriations in the same bill that apparently is carrying specific appropriations for everything, and, to my mind, should be carried in specific appropriations right down the line. Why are those two opposing principles in the same bill every year?

Mr. MERITT. That is a matter of growth, covering a long period of years.

Mr. KELLY. What is your judgment on that, Mr. Meritt?

Mr. MERITT. As to the wisdom of it?

Mr. KELLY. As to the wisdom of the policy.

His answer is the crux of the whole matter:

Mr. MERITT. If I were a Member of Congress and a member of the committee, I think I should advocate the appropriation bill being made up so that when we make an appropriation for a reservation or a school that would be the entire appropriation for that reservation or that school, so far as it would be possible to do it.

Remember, Mr. Meritt is Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs in charge of these bills, and is one of the ablest men I ever saw before a committee, adroit, resourceful, and able. I am only sorry that he is not using his splendid ability for another purpose than attempting to add to the activities of this bureaucracy. But that is what he said, and that is exactly what I attempted to do yesterday when I tried to get an amendment adopted to itemize these expenditures under reservations and under schools, so that there would not be a dollar carried in this bill that it could not be explained what it was spent for, and the activity for which it was spent. We might then know exactly what each reservation and what each school was costing.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is one important distinction between what Mr. Meritt said he would do as a Member of Congress and what the gentleman from Pennsylvania yesterday tried to do. Mr. Meritt said "so far as it was possible," or words to that effect. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania paid no attention to that, whether possible or impossible. His amendment provided that every cent spent on a reservation must be foretold in advance.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman quibbles about that, because here is an item of \$90,000 for the transportation of school children. In my State of Pennsylvania they also pay out money for the transportation of pupils, and I can find at Harrisburg an account of every dollar that has been spent by the township. I can show you where that money goes, and at very little clerical expense, but the \$90,000 carried here is a lump appropriation expended here and there without any statement as to the reservation it is spent on, so that we can not tell the total expenditure for any reservation. If estimates can not be made in advance, the Budget policy is a mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have no doubt that the gentleman can ascertain from the Indian Service what has been spent, but no one can definitely foretell just how many dollars of this will be spent next year on each reservation, and that is what the gentleman called for in his amendment.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes; and I called also for a statement of expenditures made. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CRAMTON] will do this when the bill comes before the committee next year. He says it can easily be done for the last year; that is, that he can get the total expenditure for each reservation and for each school, from all these items, so that it can be laid before the committee. If he will do that, then we will know exactly where this money has been spent. I shall be glad to see that done when next year's bill is presented to this House.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understood the gentleman to say that the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania makes appropriations itemizing the amount to be paid to every township.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; I do not ask for that. I want the bureau to bring the estimates and show where the money was spent. We do that in the Legislature of Pennsylvania and we know how much was spent in each township.

Mr. HAYDEN. Do you make a lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. HICKS. What the gentleman wants is for them to make a post-mortem examination.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; but I want the amount laid out and to show how the money was spent last year. That was the point that I wanted to bring out in the discussion we had yesterday, and I hope that Mr. Meritt's suggestion as to what he would do if he was a Member of Congress will be carried out next year.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the controversy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself on yesterday was clean-cut and there should be no confusion about it.

What the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated was that a part of the school appropriation could be used for farmers out on the reservation and away from the schools. He read from what he said was a record of old hearings. As I understood his reading them, he made Mr. Meritt say the same thing, to wit, that a part of a school appropriation could be used for paying farmers out on the reservation away from the school. I wondered at the time that the assistant commissioner, familiar with conditions from his long service in the bureau, could have knowingly made any such erroneous assertion. Since the alleged statement has been published in yesterday's RECORD I find that Mr. Meritt made no such statement and in fact no statement that could be distorted into any such misleading construction. Let us see what Mr. Meritt did say. I read from the statement placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, credited to Mr. Meritt:

Mr. CARTER. Now, Mr. Meritt, let me ask you, can you use funds from a general fund for a purpose for which a specific appropriation is made under the law?

Mr. MERITT. Where there is a specific appropriation for a specific purpose we are not permitted to supplement that appropriation by any other fund. For example, where we have an appropriation for a non-reservation school we would not be permitted to use any of the general appropriation for school support to supplement the specific appropriation for a nonreservation school. \* \* \*

Mr. CARTER. Now, Mr. Meritt, what do you use that \$6,000 for; for the Klamaths?

Mr. MERITT. We use it for administrative purposes on the Klamath Reservation.

Mr. CARTER. Can you take here from the general administrative appropriation any funds to use for administrative purposes there?

Mr. MERITT. We could take from the Indian school support.

Mr. CARTER. But that is not answering the question. My question was: Could you take it from the general administration item in the bill?

Mr. SNYDER. That support of the Indian schools is a general administrative item.

Mr. MERITT. We have no fund that is known as the general administrative item. These items are particularized for school support. For example, we could use a part of the lump-sum appropriation for school support in maintaining schools on that reservation; we could use part of the appropriation for relieving distress for maintaining physicians on that reservation. We could use part of the appropriation for the farmers in paying the salary of a farmer on that reservation.

Mr. CARTER. But you could not do it if you had a specific appropriation for any of those purposes, could you?

Mr. MERITT. No, sir.

Thus it will be seen that the controversy between Mr. Meritt and myself was not whether in expending these funds he could cross the line of school appropriations and go over to industrial appropriations. The controversy was strictly whether he could apply funds from a general item to supplement funds appropriated for a specific purpose. Specifically, could he use a specific item for administrative purposes on a certain reservation and then draw from a general administration item for expenditures on that same reservation. Never was the question discussed as to diverting funds appropriated for schools to the use of farmers; and this statement, placed in the RECORD by the gentleman himself, does not warrant the assertion that anyone connected with the Indian Bureau ever made any such foolish assertion.

Let me call attention to that portion of the commissioner's alleged statement pertinent to this controversy, in order that this membership may judge for itself if there is indeed any further proof necessary. Mr. Meritt said:

Mr. MERITT. We have no fund that is known as the general administrative item. These items are particularized for school support. For example, we could use a part of the lump-sum appropriation for school support in maintaining schools on that reservation; we could use part of the appropriation for relieving distress for maintaining physicians on that reservation. We could use part of the appropriation for the farmers in paying the salary of a farmer on that reservation.

Mr. CARTER. But you could not do it if you had a specific appropriation for any of those purposes, could you?

Mr. MERITT. No, sir.

That is the language of Mr. Meritt, as quoted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and it is as unmistakable and plain as the English tongue could make it.

Does Mr. Meritt say that moneys appropriated for schools may be used for farmers? No; not even by the remotest implication. He simply says in plain, blunt English words, "We



could use a part of the lump-sum appropriation for school support in maintaining schools on that reservation," and later on, "We could use part of the appropriation for the farmers," meaning the lump sum, "in paying the salary of a farmer on that reservation." Nothing could be plainer, nothing could be less ambiguous, nothing could be more distinct and intelligible, and in no place, in no particular does this statement placed in the Record by the gentleman from Pennsylvania himself even remotely intimate any such foolish assertion by the assistant commissioner as that he was authorized to use funds appropriated for schools in the employment of Indian farmers out on the reservation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Turning from the controversy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Oklahoma as to what is the point of controversy between them, I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee just how this money is used for placing the school pupils under the control of white families. Do these Indian children who are placed in the homes of white families remain there permanently? Do they become members of the family with the white people, so that they are subject to the regulations of the home and likely to be called upon to work as the other children would be in the household? What is the general plan in the expenditure of this appropriation?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not sure that I can answer all of the gentleman's inquiries, but approximately \$5,000 of this appropriation is expended in obtaining remunerative employment for Indian youths, and for the payment of transportation to the places of employment. The other portion of it is transportation, sending pupils from their homes to the nonreservation boarding schools. Of course, that involves some transportation, but the portion the gentleman refers to is the expenditure of the \$5,000, which is to secure employment in white homes and otherwise for Indian youths, the intention being, I assume, to place the Indian in the surroundings of modern American homes where he will acquire a full knowledge of the English language, of American customs, and at the same time be in employment where he will be self-supporting and perhaps earning something in addition thereto.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, the \$5,000 is set aside for obtaining employment, but then there is the item of collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian public schools; but the item to which I am directing particular attention is for placing school pupils, with the consent of their parents, under the care and control of white families qualified to give them moral, industrial, and educational training. Do these white families take these Indian children into their homes?

Mr. CRAMTON. In some instances.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And give them training, send them to schools, and are paid for that purpose?

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me read from what Mr. Meritt said:

Mr. MERITT. You will also notice that a part of that money is used for the purpose of procuring employment for our Indian youths. We have a large number of children, for example, at the Riverside School in California, who go out for employment. At Mr. Peairs's school, Haskell Institute, they have a number who go out for employment when the school is not in session.

Mr. PEAIRS. Yes; we have quite a large number every summer, during the vacation months, that we send out in the neighborhood of 50, 60, or 75 miles of the school into homes and on farms.

Mr. MERITT. We feel that this is good education for them, to get out in the white homes, during the summer vacations, and learn how the white people live, as well as earn their money, and cultivate the habit of industry.

I think the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is familiar with the subject and could give it more in detail to the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Then I shall ask the gentleman from Oklahoma whether this is the placing of school pupils in the homes of white families only during vacation periods.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I expect I can better inform the gentleman by giving him a general statement about it. This money is used for the transportation of pupils to and from their homes. It is also used for securing employment for the pupil both before and after leaving the school—before he leaves the school in the vacation period and after he leaves the school, of course, in permanent employment. Then there is the third, and a very beneficial purpose, which is set forth by the language which the gentleman from Michigan has just quoted, and that is what is known as the outing system. In many of the Indian schools the term lasts only about eight school months. It begins in September and runs for eight months, giving the child in some of those Indian schools about four or five months' vacation. During that vacation the child is sent out into white families, the girl usually to learn cooking and sewing and housekeeping with some good white woman

who must furnish proper testimonials as to character and other things, and then the boys are sent out to families to do farm and dairy and other work of that kind.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But only during the time of the vacation period?

Mr. CARTER. Only then.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. So that these white families do not have control of the general education of the child?

Mr. CARTER. Oh, no; the child goes back to the school when it begins again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The policy proposed yesterday by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] is not a complex one. It is not ridiculous. There is nothing about it that calls for any action that is unreasonable. He merely proposed that the Indian commissioner should submit to the Committee on Appropriations a detailed estimate of the amount of money that he would need for each separate project. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] immediately interposed that it is a post-mortem proposition. It is not. He is asking for these estimates before we appropriate the money. That is not post-mortem. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] in trying to crush the proposition said that it is perfectly reasonable to ask him to tell how he spent the money after he spends it, but that it is impossible for him to tell us what his estimates are of the amount of money that he is going to need for the coming fiscal year. That is the way he disposes of it.

There is nothing unreasonable about the proposition of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think it is a wise policy and one that ought to be adopted. Take that Book of Estimates and go through it, and there is not a subject in there, not a single analysis that is given, that does not embrace the item of "miscellaneous" involving thousands of dollars; that does not embrace "outstanding indebtedness" that involves several hundred thousand dollars, the itemization of which is not shown at all. I think the committee ought to be reasonable. I think that when a sane proposition like that offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is proposed, where it has merit, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS], who comes from the leading business State of this Nation, ought to appreciate the business horse sense that is involved in the policy, and he ought to get behind it.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. My thought when I made the remark about its being post-mortem was that in many of these items you can not tell in advance what money is going to be refunded until it is refunded.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I am not talking about refunding, I am talking about spending. I am talking about what the gentleman from Pennsylvania was talking about when he said we must demand estimates of the amount of money proposed to be expended in the next fiscal year. That is what his amendment had to deal with. If, as was stated by the gentleman from Michigan, it is impossible to give estimates, then our whole Budget system is a farce. Our whole Budget system is founded on the policy of giving reliable information in advance of the expenditure. It is impossible to go into detail before the Budget Committee. All the Budget Committee demands is general estimates. Then it becomes the province of the Committee on Appropriations, after the Budget Committee gets its general estimates, to get the estimates in specific detail.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman should admit that anything that the chairman of the subcommittee has done has been with an effort to differentiate between the cases where an itemization was possible and desirable, and other cases where itemization to the degree demanded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not only impossible, without tremendous expense, and probably impossible even then to foretell, but also unnecessary and quite undesirable.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to submit to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan this proposition: If he will take that so-called Book of Estimates and go to his office and spend a month on it, he can not tell within a million dollars of where the money is going specifically. It is just one conglomeration of generalities. Go through it, look at the analyses of estimates given there, and then the explanation that is attempted in the succeeding pages, and you will find that it is one generality after another. You can not tell within a million dollars of where the money is really going.



I think in view of the fact that the House has given these 35 men this tremendous power and responsibility, when a Member from Pennsylvania like our distinguished friend [Mr. KELLY] offers a wise policy, I think it ought to be treated seriously and given due consideration by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INDUSTRIAL WORK AND CARE OF TIMBER.

For the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, and to educate Indians in the proper care of forests; for the employment of suitable persons as matrons to teach Indian women and girls housekeeping and other household duties, for necessary traveling expenses of such matrons, and for furnishing necessary equipments and supplies and renting quarters of them where necessary; for the conducting of experiments on Indian school or agency farms designed to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, vegetables, cotton, and fruits, and for the employment of practical farmers and stockmen, in addition to the agency and school farmers now employed; for necessary traveling expenses of such farmers and stockmen and for furnishing necessary equipment and supplies for them; and for superintending and directing farming and stock raising among Indians, \$375,000, of which sum not less than \$50,000 shall be used for the employment of field matrons and nurses: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not, as to timber, apply to the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$20,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be used to conduct experiments on Indian school or agency farms to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, cotton, grain, vegetables, and fruits: *And provided further*, That the amounts paid to matrons, foresters, farmers, physicians, nurses, and other hospital employees, and stockmen provided for in this act shall not be included within the limitations on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, merely for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. HICKS. I have not had the opportunity of going through these hearings, and so this may be a foolish or academic question. But why is the proviso in there excluding the Menominee Indian Reservation from the operation of this act?

Mr. CRAMTON. The Menominee Indian Reservation lumbering, as I understand, is a separate proposition, which at one time was a matter of considerable controversy in Congress before my time. There are extensive lumbering operations now going on there. It is cared for by separate legislation, and it is my impression that the exclusion clause here is to avoid having this act taken as in any way amending or interfering with the other act.

I will say to the gentleman further that this is an appropriation to aid in carrying on industrial and other work. The Menominee operations are self-supporting, and it is not necessary to use any of this money for that purpose. Further, there are in the hearings statements from the Indian Service as to the progress of these Menominee operations, showing the profits obtained, and so forth.

Mr. HICKS. Has this proviso been carried in other bills for many years?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; and there is no necessity for any appropriation for the Menominee operations, and that would be a sufficient reason for its exclusion here.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### GENERAL EXPENSES OF INDIAN SERVICE.

For pay of special agents, at \$2,000 per annum; for traveling and incidental expenses of such special agents, including sleeping car fare and a per diem of not to exceed \$3.50 in lieu of subsistence, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, when actually employed on duty in the field or ordered to the seat of government; for transportation and incidental expenses of officers and clerks of the Office of Indian Affairs when traveling on official duty; for pay of employees not otherwise provided for; and for other necessary expenses of the Indian Service for which no other appropriation is available, \$109,500: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of this appropriation may be used for continuing the work of the Competency Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$15,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended out of applicable funds in the work of determining the competency of Indians on Indian reservations outside of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend on page 28, line 6, after the semicolon, by striking out the words "For pay of employees not otherwise provided for."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 28, line 6, after the word "duty," strike out the words "For pay of employees not otherwise provided for."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph carries an appropriation which is indeed general. It

is styled "General expenses of Indian Service, \$109,500." It is in addition to the items carrying practically every class of employees known to the Government, and the justification on page 209 of the hearings had before the subcommittee gives this statement:

The purpose of the fund, "General expenses, Indian Service," is adequately set forth in the title. It is used exclusively for general and not specific purposes. There are about 150 different agencies and schools throughout the country, nearly every State west of the Mississippi River having one or more agencies or schools within its territory. To carry on the work of these various schools and agencies it is necessary to employ over 5,000 persons in order that the work may be efficiently and expeditiously carried on. A force of special agents and supervisors is maintained for the purpose of making regular and periodic inspections of the various agencies and schools to see that all work is properly and carefully carried on.

Now in the analysis the salaries and wages and traveling expenses of these employees carried in this item amounts to \$84,000; \$84,000 out of some \$109,000. I submit that here is a case where we should at least stop putting a general provision in for the pay of employees not otherwise provided for. There are teachers, agents, inspectors, farmers, stockmen, and supervisors to infinity carried in this bill specifically, and an item of this kind adding still others under a general clause seems to me unjustifiable.

Mr. BLANTON. And it involves \$109,500.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes; and it can be eliminated without doing any injury, and making a saving of that much to the taxpayers. I believe that at least, after making a general appropriation of \$109,500, we should take out the blanket authority of putting in other employees without specifically stating where they shall be sent or for what purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Do the hearings disclose where this money is likely to be spent and upon whom?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. They do not. There is no showing for reservation or school, although we heard yesterday about this wonderful Book of Estimates which, it was contended, itemized everything. I believe that an expenditure like that should be segregated according to the reservation and school. We should not attempt to deceive ourselves in a matter of this kind. This is a wasteful policy and my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the item involved here for the main part is analyzed in detail by the department to the committee. It does include the language to which reference has been made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]. The item is one that would need to be taken care of either in this general way or else it would need to be taken care of by an allocation of the amount of money involved to the various agencies having to do with the Indian work.

For instance, we have seven supervisors at definite salaries; we have three special agents; we have four traveling auditors; we have one supervisor, five superintendents, one chief clerk, eight clerks and financial clerks, and other definite employees who are engaged in some definite class of work. Then in addition to that we have occasion to use miscellaneous and temporary employees for a particular short period of time in bringing up work at one agency or another, and it is more economical to handle this work by having a lump sum, not too large, from which these expenses may be borne. It will be no economy to strike this item from the bill here, because you will need to provide definite items for the different agencies throughout the country, and the items would need to be large enough in each case to take care of the maximum expenditure required in each particular instance. In this case we can keep the item fairly small, because then it is elastic, and it can be used to meet an emergency whenever it may arise. The item should remain in the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Could the gentleman tell us out of the five thousand and odd employees in the Indian Service how many are Indians? Have you any record of it?

Mr. FRENCH. About 2,000 employees.

Mr. RAKER. Can the gentleman advise the committee whether or not it is the policy of the service to give competent Indians, both men and women—young men and young women as well—employment wherever opportunity presents itself?

Mr. FRENCH. It is the general policy, and my impression is not only that it is the general policy but that in many instances it is required. Officers coming before the committee have testified of their great desire to have Indians employed in various capacities for the effect in encouraging other Indians and for the training it gives the Indians who are employed.



Mr. CARTER. The general rule is to give the Indians preference. That has been carried to the extent of establishing an Indian employment division within the Indian Bureau, headed by Charley Dagenette, a Peoria Indian, as I recall. It is a part of his business to look after the employment of Indians in the service, and look after their welfare and see that they do not get the worst of it in promotions and otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Is it the policy to give them employment wherever they can under these circumstances?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly, and that is done.

Mr. FRENCH. The last two items that we passed over I think are entirely for Indian employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, on line 13, page 28, to strike out after the word "appropriated" the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof the word "shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 28, line 13, strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is not a good way of getting at what I desire, but I can see no other way of stating it than to provide that \$15,000 shall be expended for determining the competency of Indians on Indian reservations. I realize that the word "may" there gives a leeway which might be justifiable if a real effort were being made to determine the competency of these Indians; but the difficulty has been that a policy has gone on for years under which only a very few Indians a year are declared competent. Where there should be thousands, there are only tens. It seems to me that 91 years of hothousing these Indians and supporting and civilizing them at a cost of many millions were ought to be able to produce some competent Indians. There never was a normal Indian who, with 21 years' training under American conditions, could not become a competent citizen. I do not believe there are any more Indians than white men who would be naturally incompetent if they were given the same opportunities and the same environment. But the Indian Bureau can not exist without the Indians, and that is the philosophy that runs through these bills. I believe that we should do the best we can here to declare the policy that there shall be real efforts made on the part of the Indian Bureau officials to declare these Indians competent, to cut them loose and let them sink or swim. That is the only way that manhood ever develops, by letting men out to face the difficulties of life and to win or to fail. Some white men fail and so some Indians will fail, but the majority of them will get to their feet and will come to a point where they will win a place as members in the American community. I hope that something can be done which will indicate that Congress is determined to see that the Indians who are really competent are declared competent, their lands given them, their division of the tribal funds made, and then take them for all time from the clutches of the Indian Bureau, whose existence is the reason for the expenditure of these vast funds.

Mr. STEPHENS. Following the gentleman's line of argument, does he not think it would be a good idea to abolish all of our civil service laws in order to turn out those who are dependent upon them?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. There is this difference: The personnel in any other bureau of the Government is not the same kind of a bureaucracy as in a bureau where you are dealing with helpless wards. These Indians are wards. They can not vote—

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. There is not an Indian in Oklahoma who has not full rights, and every member of the Five Civilized Tribes is like all the other citizens of the United States.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, that only applies to one State. I do not mean to say that all of the Indians can not vote. But if all could vote to-day, there would be a different Indian policy.

Mr. CARTER. This only applies to the Five Civilized Tribes?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; I am amending the other item, outside of the Five Civilized Tribes. The gentleman does not understand what he is talking about. If he will follow my amendment he will see that I leave out the Five Civilized Tribes and that I have offered to amend the next item, leaving it so that he can take care of his own Five Civilized Tribes if he so desires.

Mr. CARTER. Let me find out what the gentleman's amendment really is.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. These Indians in the majority of cases have no votes. They are the ones on the reservations. They have very little influence; but here is a bureau that has considerable influence, because it has the power to give certain things to its friends. I believe if there is a choice between standing for the Indians and standing for the Indian Bureau, Congress should stand for the Indians, and that means that you will have to declare these Indians competent when they are competent. I have known of cases where Indians had great ability but could not get allotments, could not get themselves declared competent, although they were competent in fact; could not be turned loose, no matter how earnestly they requested it.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand the gentleman has moved to strike out the word "may," in line 13, on page 28, and to substitute the word "shall."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. That proviso, as I understand, refers entirely to the Five Civilized Tribes?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Not at all. This refers to those who are outside of the Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman repeat his amendment? Perhaps I am mistaken.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. My amendment is on page 28, line 13.

Mr. CARTER. What does the gentleman propose?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I propose to strike out the word "may" and to insert the word "shall," so that this bureau shall get our idea that we want Indians who are really competent declared competent and turned loose. This does not touch the Five Civilized Tribes. Perhaps the gentleman from Oklahoma says they do not need any competency commission.

Mr. CARTER. I never made any such statement, and I have a commission provided in here for that.

Mr. BUTLER. I asked my question because of the statement made by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. It is just the opposite of what the gentleman from Oklahoma stated. I leave out the Five Civilized Tribes and am trying to get a competency commission on the other reservations. It simply provides for \$15,000 for determining the competency of Indians who are entitled to it and declaring them competent with such benefits as accrue from such action.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania undertakes to put strange words in my mouth and assign positions to me that I never occupied when he says that I have taken the position that the Five Civilized Tribes did not need any competency commission. If the gentleman will look at the bottom of page 29 he will find there an item for a competency commission for the Five Civilized Tribes. That item was placed in the bill several years ago by an amendment proposed by me and has been carried along ever since. For several years we used the mandatory term there, but we found that we were getting no further by using the word "shall" than by using the word "may." The language provided that "not less than \$15,000 shall be used for a competency commission for the Five Civilized Tribes," and so forth, yet in the analysis of expenditures subsequently submitted to our committee we found that only \$5,000 had been expended. We had no desire to force the expenditure of money on the bureau that could not and will not be used in relieving the Indians from the bureau supervision. Our friend from Pennsylvania seems to labor under the delusion that no progress has been made with reference to the releasing of the Indian.

Let me call his attention to a few outstanding facts. There are a few more than 101,000 enrolled members of the Five Civilized Tribes. As late as 1908—14 years ago—all of them were restricted Indians and not a single one could sell his property nor execute any valid contract with reference to it without permission of the great White Father at Washington. Within the duration of these 14 years restrictions as to alienation and contract have been removed from nearly 70,000, leaving only a bit more than 30,000, or about one-third, still re-



maining under Government supervision. Every member of less than one-half Indian blood has all restrictions removed and every Indian of less than three-quarters has every inhibition removed except homestead restrictions, and practically all educated full bloods and those of more than half blood have been released from all restrictions.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Why should these Indians be continually carried on the bureau rolls and held under supervision as tribal Indians are held?

Mr. CARTER. I think I have just shown that about two-thirds of them are not held under supervision at all, and I know of no reason why their names should be dropped from their rolls simply because they have been declared competent. Moreover, it is necessary to carry the names on the rolls of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes, for they still have a residue of tribal property undisposed of. The tribal affairs of the Cherokees, numbering about 41,000 members, have been completely disposed of, and the tribal government abolished. The tribal affairs of the Creeks and Seminoles, some 17,000, as I now recall, have all been settled with the exception of three boarding schools. All the tribal property of the Choctaws and Chickasaws has been sold and that estate wound up with the exception of their segregated mineral lands. Most of the surface of the mineral land has been sold, all the asphalt deposits have been sold, and about 20 to 25 per cent of the coal deposits are sold, as I now recall. The department claims to have been unable to sell the remaining coal deposits on account of the general depression affecting the price. When the balance of these coal deposits are sold another per capita payment to Choctaws and Chickasaws will be in order under the law, and certainly that could not be made unless the names of all the beneficiaries were carried on some kind of authentic document, whether you call it a bureau roll, a roster, a list, or whatnot.

More than \$25,000,000 of their funds have been distributed among the enrolled members of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes during the past six years, making a per capita distribution of about \$1,000 to every man, woman, and child enrolled with the two tribes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. My amendment does not touch the Five Civilized Tribes. It applies to the others; and does not the gentleman, who has had a great deal of experience and who knows as much about Indian affairs as the committee—and I sat with him pleasantly on the committee that investigated the Indian Bureau and I know that he has tried to solve these great problems—I want to ask him if \$15,000 is too much to spend for the purpose of getting competent Indians out from under the bureau and giving them a chance to be American citizens in American communities.

Mr. CARTER. I was not inveighing against the gentleman's amendment, either with reference to the Five Civilized Tribes or other Indians. I have no objection to it; the only thing I was undertaking to do was to keep the gentleman from Pennsylvania from putting me in a false position; putting words into my mouth which I never uttered. Notwithstanding the great progress made in releasing the Indians and admitting of them into full-fledged citizenship, if I had thought they needed no other release from restrictions I would not have agreed to the appropriation of \$15,000 for the competency commission. I was on the subcommittee that reported it and insisted that it stay in the bill.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman did agree to have the word "may" substituted for the word "shall."

Mr. CARTER. Yes; and for a good reason. We had found that in the bill of the last fiscal year it was provided that the bureau "shall" use \$15,000.

The officials of the bureau said that they were unable to use more than \$5,000. Therefore, what is the use of camouflaging and demagoguing, pretending to do something for little political gain in Oklahoma, that does not serve any beneficial purpose in the way of legislation? I want to get results; I do not want to make any grandstand play. I want to get my people down there graduated into full-fledged citizenship, so that they will be able to take care of themselves at the earliest pos-

sible moment. Every step I take is in that direction, and there is no use of trying to do something which we have found impossible. That is why I agreed that the word "shall" should go out.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is not opposed to this amendment?

Mr. CARTER. No; it is a matter of no consequence, one way or the other. The bureau officials will use it if they deem it necessary and they will not use it if they think it unnecessary, regardless of the language you put in the bill, and our most recent experience has proven that to be a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INDUSTRY AMONG INDIANS.

For the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians and to aid them in the culture of fruits, grains, and other crops, \$80,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, which sum may be used for the purchase of seeds, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to enable Indians to become self-supporting: *Provided*, That said sum shall be expended under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for its repayment to the United States on or before June 30, 1930: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$15,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended on any one reservation or for the benefit of any one tribe of Indians, and that no part of this appropriation shall be used for the purchase of tribal herds.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information. This item proposes an expenditure of \$80,000 for the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians, to aid them in the culture of fruits, grains, and other crops. On page 26 of the bill there is a section dealing with industrial work and the care of timber. A reading of that section discloses the fact that it is proposed by that appropriation to encourage and aid the Indians in the cultivation of grain, vegetables, fruit, and so forth. Will the gentleman in charge of the bill explain why it is necessary to split those items? How is the work related? It seems to cover the same service. The item last referred to on page 26 of the bill is for the cultivation of vegetables, cotton, and fruit. This item just read has to do with the cultivation of fruit, grains, and other crops.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, the item at the bottom of page 25 running onto page 26 is for the purpose of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations, and so forth, and the conduct of experiments on agency farms, and the teaching of domestic science and farming and stock raising, and so forth. The item before us is to accomplish the same general purpose, but through a somewhat different method, for encouraging industry by the purchase of seeds, animals, and so forth. In that connection the department says that under this plan no money is loaned to the Indians directly, but the appropriation is used for the purchase of seeds, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, in the discretion of the Secretary, to enable the Indians to become self-supporting.

The department further says:

The Indians generally appreciate the benefits of this appropriation and make every effort to pay the amounts due under their agreements. They are allowed six years to pay for live stock and four years to pay for other articles. This appropriation has been one of the largest factors in the industrial progress of the Indians and has enabled many Indians to become self-supporting who would otherwise still be dependent upon the Government. The appropriation has been used on about 80 different reservations located in practically all the Western States, and nearly 40,000 Indians have received direct benefits therefrom.

From the total appropriations of about \$4,000,000 that have been made, \$2,400,000 has been repaid. The general purpose is the same, but the one is through methods of instruction and the other through giving them equipment with which to carry on the industry.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is this activity—that is, the one with reference to the purchase of seeds, animals, tools, and so forth—closely related to the work of experimentation, and so forth, covered by the paragraph on page 25?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is a relation that is necessary, and they are both parts of a plan to bring about eventually the self-support of the Indians, but it is necessary that the two activities be carried on side by side.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I suggest to the gentleman, though I would not undertake to put my opinion against his knowledge, he having studied the matter, that the purchase of seeds, tools, and general application of that which is ascertained by experimentation ought to be very closely related to the experimentation. In other words, the people who make the experiments determine that a given grain or cotton, or whatever



agricultural commodity they have, is well suited to a given locality, and ought to have to do with the purchase of the seeds.

Mr. CRAMTON. I assume that is the case. I call the gentleman's attention, however, to the items themselves. This is a reimbursable item; the money is to come back to the Government, and, as a matter of fact, it is coming back. Out of \$4,000,000 heretofore appropriated, \$2,400,000 has been repaid. The other is a gratuity that does not come back; it is for instruction.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is there any additional personnel employed, the salary of which is a burden on this activity, by reason of the item on page 29?

Mr. CARTER. No. The principal difference between the two items is that one is reimbursable and the other is a gratuity. That is the only difference. One is used in connection with the other.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma has overlooked the fact that there is a little item of \$4,800 for salaries out of the \$80,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. How much money has been expended through this paragraph?

Mr. CRAMTON. Four million dollars, beginning with 1912. In one year as much as \$600,000 was appropriated.

Mr. BUTLER. How much has been recovered?

Mr. CRAMTON. Two million four hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BUTLER. About \$1,600,000 remaining unpaid?

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, the time has not expired.

Mr. BUTLER. We are bound to lose something, of course. I know that, and I am not making any criticism of anyone. I think this is one of the useful things in the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. We should emphasize the fact that \$2,400,000 has come back. The percentage has been much better than has been our experience with the white farmers of the West where seeds were furnished them.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ARIZONA.

For support and civilization of Indians in Arizona, including pay of employees, \$185,000.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 31, line 20, after the figures "\$185,000," add the following: "Provided, That in this item and in all others in this act making appropriations for the support and civilization of Indians not more than 25 per cent of the amount here appropriated shall be expended for salaries, wages, and expenses of employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is the first specific item for the support and civilization of Indians. It carries \$185,000 for the Indians of Arizona. This bill carries these items for support and civilization in a total of \$3,219,700. That is in addition to the appropriation of \$370,000 for the relief of distress and in addition to the appropriation of \$150,000 for vehicles used in the service, and in addition to the payment for Indian schools and others. This is an item used in a certain way called "for support and civilization."

Now I make the requirement in my amendment that for these special appropriations at least 75 cents out of a dollar shall go to the benefit of the Indians themselves, and that only 25 per cent of it be spent for salaries and expenses of employees.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. How does the gentleman expect the Indian to get this other 75 per cent? How is he going to have the money delivered to him?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I would get that 75 cents delivered to him at an expense of 25 cents. I will show what has been done on a few items in this bill. Colorado receives an appropriation for support and civilization of Indians of \$3,788, and under that the salaries and wages were \$2,605. That was for salaries and wages alone and did not include traveling expenses, supplies, and so forth. For the Florida Indians last year the appropriation for support and civilization was \$6,535, while salaries and wages alone consumed \$4,187. In Idaho, on the Fort Hall Indians there was expended \$24,361; for salaries and wages, \$14,391. In Kansas, on the Pottawatomies there was expended \$3,230, and out of that \$2,154 went for salaries and wages. In Minnesota, for the Chippewas there was spent \$43,200, and for salaries \$30,319. In Montana, at the Fort Peck Agency there was expended \$28,081, and for salaries and wages, \$19,171.

I believe if you go through this bill you will find that more than 50 per cent of these appropriations for support and civilization of Indians went to salaries and wages alone, not count-

ing their expenses. That is not support and civilization of the Indians. That is the support of the Indian Bureau and the pauperization of the Indians. If Congress takes money out of the Treasury for the support and civilization of the Indians, its benefits ought to go to them, not in cash alone, but the things purchased should be for the benefit of the Indians themselves.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman think that too much of the money goes to the civilizer here?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I surely do. I think the support is for the employees of the Indian Bureau instead of for the Indians.

This is a reasonable proposition, Mr. Chairman. I realize we have not a quorum here and it is impossible to secure the passage of amendments with the few Members here present. But this is a reasonable proposition, that 25 per cent is enough out of each dollar for the support and civilization of the Indians to be spent on the employees of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman please explain to the committee how it will civilize the Indian to pay him money out of the Treasury?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows I am not talking about that. I am anxious that the benefits shall go to the Indians.

Mr. HAYDEN. You want to take three-quarters of this money, as I understand it, and give it to the Indians in cash?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, no. The support and civilization is not given in cash. We have rations and relief of distress provided in other items.

Mr. HAYDEN. You want to give them rations and relief?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, no. I want this padded salary list cut in two or more. I believe this amendment of mine would save \$800,000 to the Treasury and that the help that the Indians get would be exactly what it is now.

Mr. LAYTON. If that is the case, is it not worth while having a quorum to settle the question?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, no. If we had a quorum we would have some constructive amendments put into this bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is not civilization largely a matter of education, and is not education largely a matter of salaries?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, I am talking about the large proportion of these funds being spent in salaries and wages under the title of support and civilization.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does not the gentleman's amendment provide that 25 per cent of the appropriation shall be applied to the Indians in the field?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No. I am willing that these items for schools and relief of distress, and so on, should be given largely in salaries to teachers and physicians, but when we come in and appropriate \$3,000,000 and more for support and civilization of the Indians I want that money to be spent for the Indians.

Mr. BRITTEN. What is the gentleman's definition of civilization if it is not education? Education, of course, must necessarily go through the salary pay roll.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not know that this bill carries \$5,000,000 a year for education alone, and that this item we are discussing is an entirely different matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, this is an item that is similar to a great many that appear throughout the bill, and hence I think that the situation should be clearly put before the committee. The item is for the support and civilization of Indians in Arizona, \$185,000. That money could be used in different ways. We could ship out to an Army post \$185,000 worth of bacon, cloth, and so forth, and tell the Indians "Come on, boys, and we will support you as long as that \$185,000 lasts," and there would be no expenditure for salaries. One hundred per cent of the appropriation would go to the Indians. In that way it would go further than the gentleman is suggesting; but whether it would really be for the benefit of the Indians is a question on which most authorities disagree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Most of the authorities will agree that the proper policy is not to give the Indian corn, but to help him to learn how to raise corn and handle his land so as to produce corn for his own support. Most authorities will agree that that is the most beneficial and in the long run the most economical to the Government.



Now, as to this item, the department said:

The Indians to be benefited under this appropriation number approximately 43,300, of which 42,992 are full bloods.

Only \$5 per Indian approximately is expended. If you buy bacon, corn, and so forth, \$5 would not last long.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Of course, the gentleman understands that other items are being used along with this \$185,000 for support and civilization.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am now talking about this item. I read further:

These Indians are scattered over a territory composed of 18,653,014 acres. As most of the land in this State is not adapted to agriculture, many of the Indians are engaged in stock raising, and every effort is being made to advance them along this and similar lines.

In other words, it is a matter of education, as the gentleman from Illinois has emphasized. The greater part of this appropriation is to be expended in the payment of salaries of employees of the several agencies. The gentleman wanted information, and it is here in the hearings.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I read it in the hearings, and that is the reason I introduced the amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. All right. We have nothing to conceal. The sum of \$96,660.27 is for salaries of employees at the several agencies, of which there are 13, in the performance of their official duties in instructing the Indians; not in handing out rations to them, but in instructing the Indians in the method of stock raising.

The remainder of the appropriation is to be expended for the purchase of subsistence supplies and other miscellaneous expenses in connection with the supervision of these Indians. The entire amount requested will be required for the support and civilization of the Indians in Arizona during the fiscal year 1924.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] made a speech yesterday. He says there is not a quorum here. There was not a quorum here yesterday. I am sorry his speech does not appear in the Record this morning so that those who did not hear it yesterday could have read it to-day. Those who are here to-day who were not here yesterday have not the advantage of the information the gentleman gave us yesterday. If they had heard the speech, they would know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to wipe out the Indian Service, and this amendment is just one of the amendments by which he wants to accomplish the purpose of destroying the Indian Service. I hope the committee will not support his amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER. This appropriation is \$485,000, and it carries only \$12,960.28 for subsistence. I do not know whether that is for subsistence of Indians or of employees of the bureau, or what not; but if every cent of it is used for subsistence of Indians, it is the best argument that can be offered on the floor of this House to show the advancement of the Indians. They have advanced to the point where for this great number, some 43,000 Indians—

Mr. CRAMTON. More than 42,000 full bloods.

Mr. CARTER. Forty-two thousand nine hundred full bloods, or a little less than 43,000, only \$12,000 is required for subsistence, less than 30 cents per capita, whereas I dare say 40 years ago it would have taken one-third this entire appropriation for subsistence for the same number of Indians. So I say this item is the best argument for the progress that the Indian is making and a real argument in defense of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. This money for subsistence supplies is not used for subsistence of the Indians entirely. It is used in great part for subsistence of employees.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman had only listened to what I said, he would not be wasting our time by repeating my statements. The amount expended for subsistence—\$12,000—is such a small portion of the entire amount that any controversy as to whether it be for Indians or employees would be immaterial, irrelevant, and incompetent and might well be stricken out of the record.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman would be happy if not a cent of it went to the Indians?

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman is talking about rationing the Indians, I say yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am not talking about that.

Mr. CARTER. I think the quicker you get away from the rationing system and put the Indian on his own feet, as the gentleman has been talking about, the quicker you make a self-sustaining citizen of him, and everyone should certainly know that to be the paramount purpose of the Indian Bureau. I would rather spend money in this bill for educating the Indians and making good self-sustaining citizens of them than to dole it out \$5 or \$10 at a time for rations or anything else.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] is a typical illustration of a radical change sought to be accomplished by one who has no knowledge of the actual facts and conditions on the Indian reservations. The gentleman has obtained the alleged information, which is the basis for his amendment, by hearing somebody tell about the Indians or by reading what somebody else has written about them, but never having visited these Indian reservations and having no personal information as to the facts of course the gentleman does not really know what should be done.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman made that statement yesterday, and I admitted that I did not have any reservation in my district, and that therefore I can probably give a little attention to the Indians as well as to the Indian Bureau. I have not an Indian in my district as far as I know.

Mr. HAYDEN. I regret that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no Indians residing in his district, because if he had, and had visited them on their reservations, he would know something about the conditions which exist there. Not having been upon these reservations, the gentleman has acquired from somebody else a mass of misinformation which he is now inflicting upon the House. The fact is that nine-tenths of this appropriation is spent for salaries of Indian agents, stockmen, farmers, and other employees on these reservations. If I understand the gentleman, his desire and purpose in offering his amendment is to cut down the salaries of these employees by three-fourths and expect them to live on the remaining one-fourth, and to dole out to the Indians, either in cash or in goods, the remainder of this appropriation.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No, no.

Mr. HAYDEN. That would be the worst calamity that could ever happen to the Indians of Arizona. Fortunately they have never been pauperized. The Navajos, Pimas, Papagoes, and practically all of the Indians in Arizona are self-supporting. They are not ration Indians. The Apaches are the only Indians who ever received rations, and that was at a time when they were prisoners of war. They are the only Indians in Arizona who know anything about the ration system. So long as I remain a Member of this House I shall exercise every effort to prevent any Indian in Arizona from receiving anything in the way of a direct gratuity from the Government of the United States except in the case of the old and infirm. I want every able-bodied Indian to earn his own living and to make his own way, to realize the value of a dollar because he has worked for it. If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, and I presume that he offers it in all seriousness, if it accomplishes that which he seeks to have done, it would result in having three-fourths of this money appropriated out of the Treasury and either paid to the Indians in cash or in goods. This would be a pure gratuity for which they did no work and which they did not honestly earn. This would immediately instill in the minds of the Indians the idea that Uncle Sam, the great father at Washington, owes them a living and that they do not have to work to support themselves and their families.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is not concerned about rations, and he should not be, in view of a ration which has been shown to me and for which I will give the authority, Joseph K. Dixon, of Philadelphia. This is the ration for a northern Cheyenne Indian for one month. Here are the rations for one month: Three pounds of meat, one-fourth pound of sugar, one-fourth pound of coffee, two small scoops of flour, a little baking powder, salt, and soap. That is the monthly ration for an Indian who is destitute.

Mr. HAYDEN. If that Northern Cheyenne was an able-bodied Indian he ought not to receive any rations from the Government.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. He was destitute, sick, and in a cellar with a dirt floor, with a temperature 40 degrees below zero.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then he should have been sent to one of the Indian Service hospitals.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is just one month's rations.



Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment means nothing more or less than taking money out of the Treasury of the United States and paying it over to able-bodied Indians in the State of Arizona who are now making their own way, who are entirely self-supporting, and who stand before the world as capable of earning their own living. His offering it at this time proves the truth of the old saying that "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing."

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman from Arizona allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. BUTLER. We owe a great duty to the Indians, we all admit that. But this item seems that it is costing us more to feed them than it is to attempt to educate them.

Mr. HAYDEN. Undoubtedly it would cost the Government a large sum of money to feed all of the Indians. I am certain that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would not want to thus pauperize them.

Mr. BUTLER. Not for a minute, but it seems to me that it may be necessary to expend this large sum of money for agents, inspectors, and so forth. I do not know, for I have never studied the subject as has the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are 13 reservations in Arizona and 43,300 Indians reside thereon. Does the gentleman think that \$185,000 is too much overhead to pay for the supervising of all of the affairs of the Arizona Indians, whose property includes over 18,650,000 acres of land?

Mr. BUTLER. No; I was asking the gentleman for information.

Mr. HAYDEN. In further reply to the first remark made by my friend let me say that there was a commission appointed by President Grant to study the Indian problem. That commission reported that it then cost a million dollars to kill an Indian. That figure was derived by dividing the expense of keeping soldiers in the Indian country by the number of Indians that had been killed in warfare. Therefore, the commission concluded that it would be much cheaper to feed them than to kill them, and that was the beginning of the ration system. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 250 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Fort Mojave, Ariz., and for pay of superintendent, \$50,000; for general repairs and improvements, and enlarging dining hall, \$12,000; for equipment for irrigation plant, \$8,000; in all, \$70,000.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if there is any limitation on the age of a pupil going to a day school or any of the Indian schools.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think there is no limitation of age, although, as a matter of fact, I think almost without exception they are minors.

Mr. WATSON. Is there a limitation of age at the day schools on the reservation?

Mr. CRAMTON. So far as I know—and I am a long way from being an authority—there is no limitation of age at any of the Indian schools. Almost every school, excepting those relating to some industrial activity, are attended by minors.

Mr. WATSON. Can men or women regardless of age take advantage of this appropriation?

Mr. CRAMTON. So far as I know there is nothing to prevent it, but I think that almost without exception the pupils are minors, and it is an exception that one of them is an adult.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Government require compulsory education?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; though the Government in many cases is active in securing the attendance of Indian pupils. I think the gentleman would be interested in reading in the hearings the statement in reference to education by Commissioner Burke, Mr. Meritt, and Mr. McDowell, secretary of the board of Indian commissioners, on the subject of education. All their statements are in the direction that there is a very encouraging movement on the part of the Indians to desire their children to be in school and the desire of the Indian children to go to school. Voluntary applications are greater than the facilities of the schools to accommodate them.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 800 Indian pupils at the Sherman Institute, Riverside, Calif., and for pay of superintendent, including not to exceed \$1,000 for printing and issuing school paper, \$160,000; for general repairs and improvements, including construction of additional sleeping porches, \$15,000; in all, \$175,000.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 25, after the word "porches" strike out the rest of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$40,000; in all, \$200,000."

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, last year when the Interior Department appropriation bill was before the House I offered a group of three amendments. One increased the number of students from 750 to 800. The second increased the allowance for their support from \$150,000 to \$160,000. The third, \$25,000 to provide increased capacity to take care of the additional 50 students.

The committee has adopted now the first two of my amendments offered last year and has provided for the increased attendance at this school by 50 additional pupils. They have made proper provision for their support, but the committee failed to provide funds for increasing the housing facilities. I say that because the item in this bill, "General repairs and improvements, including construction and additional sleeping porches, \$15,000," is only the same amount which has been appropriated for a number of years for general repairs and improvements at this school. It has been \$15,000 a year right along, except last year, when, there having been a small surplus left over from the year before, this item was cut down to \$14,000. It has now been put back to the sum heretofore carried for this purpose. The introduction of the additional language into this bill, to wit, "including construction for additional sleeping porches," without the appropriation of additional money means nothing. It confesses the need for additional sleeping porches but withholds the means for securing them. It is, of course, economy in one sense of the word, for we can refuse to provide any houses for them or any place for them to sleep—they can sleep on the ground—but the purpose of maintaining these schools is to teach, among other things, civilized ways of living. If we want them to retain the habits which they have on the tribal reservations, that is one thing; but when we start out with the idea that the purpose of maintaining these schools is to teach them the ways of civilized people, to teach them trades and occupations, and, for instance, to teach the girls housekeeping, then it seems to me that we ought to at least provide proper housing facilities for them.

Last year I stated that there was a waiting list of 100 Indian children who want an education but could not be admitted to this school for lack of capacity. Then the Greenville Indian School in northern California burned down and many of their students were brought down to Sherman Institute and are being taken care of there as an emergency proposition. They had to be taken care of because there was no place else for them to go. They are crammed in there to-day like sardines. It is a deplorable condition and is to be tolerated only as a temporary situation.

Mr. Meritt, the Assistant Commissioner of the Indian Bureau, has been praised very highly by the members of this committee, who say that he conducts the Indian business economically and efficiently and has never asked for a dollar that he did not need. He asked for this very item, the very amount that I am asking for, for repairs and improvements, \$15,000, which has always been allowed, and \$25,000 in addition to that for the purpose of providing these much-needed sleeping porches. For the committee to say that changing the amount of the general-repairs item for \$14,000 last year to \$15,000 this year, when it has been \$15,000 for many years, and that that \$1,000 increase is to provide sleeping porches is a joke. No man here but knows that you can not put a porch on the front of a private dwelling house for \$1,000. But they say they will do it some way. It is like making bricks without straw. It can only be done, if at all, by neglecting some vital and necessary repairs. It may be possible to build the porches and let the roofs leak, but that is mighty poor business and mighty poor economy.

I want now to read the statement of one who knows very well the situation at this school with respect to the amount of money needed for general repairs:

Last year, instead of receiving an additional appropriation it was reduced to \$14,000, which has made it difficult to provide needed improvements and repairs. Next year one and probably two new boilers will be an absolute necessity, this requiring an expenditure of approximately \$5,000. Extensive repairs to our steam-heating system are also necessary, as well as extensive repairs to the roofs and floors of many buildings, requiring more than ordinary expenditure of funds. A new pump will be needed at the school farm. We can not make these unusual as well as absolutely necessary repairs from the repair fund heretofore allowed from year to year. It is false economy to neglect necessary repairs and improvements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.



Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWING. It seems to me that the committee has overlooked a vital part of this item and has failed to provide any money with which to build the sleeping porches, although it declares that the schools should be equipped with sleeping porches.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. How many pupils were there at the time this amount was admitted—750?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. And they propose to admit 50 more and make the same allowance?

Mr. SWING. Yes; but in the meantime they have taken in an additional number. There are in the school now 791, but they are in a deplorable condition—three and four of them jammed into one small room, a thing which would not be permitted under ordinary health and sanitary rules and regulations of any modern city. It is a temporary condition, however, which should be promptly remedied.

I feel there has been an unwarranted discrimination against this school, because the committee in the case of every other school of this class, where they have added 50 pupils they have also added a substantial sum to the usual amount of the repair fund for the purpose of building additional sleeping porches, and only in the instance of the Sherman Institute have they failed to provide any appropriation over and above the amount usually appropriated for ordinary repairs.

This school, in my opinion, is one of the best schools in the United States. It gives the most for the money. Last year the committee brought out the information that out of 26 schools in the United States 65 per cent exceeded the lawful maximum rate per capita, which is \$250 where there are less than 200 pupils and \$225 where there are more than 200 pupils. This school in Riverside made the remarkable record last year of \$168 per capita. There are only two other schools in the United States that beat it. One is at Cherokee, in North Carolina, which is an unfair comparison, because there a number of the pupils are day students only, and the Government is not paying for their food and clothing. The other is the Chilocco school in Oklahoma, which is partially endowed, because it owns 8,000 acres of land, 6,000 of which are under cultivation. Taking school for school, of those which are in the same class as this, you will find that this school is the most economically and efficiently operated Indian school in the United States. With this fine record we ought not to hesitate to provide facilities for taking care of those Indian children who desire to attend this school. I agree with the committee and compliment it upon the idea that they are carrying out of enlarging these schools, because they have found it to be true that where they increased the number of students at a school they decreased the per capita cost, because the overhead is about the same in any event.

Mr. HAYDEN. Where do the pupils come from that principally attend the Sherman Institute?

Mr. SWING. I have 12 reservations in my district; some of them come from along the Colorado River.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the gentleman sure that none of them come from outside of the State of California?

Mr. SWING. Oh, yes; they come from all the Southwest, because the school has an excellent standing and a fine reputation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is it not a fact that much more than half the students at that school are from States outside of California?

Mr. SWING. I do not think as many as that. There was last year a waiting list of 100. I tried to get 2 pupils in myself, but was unable to get them in.

Mr. HAYDEN. And those were California Indians that the gentleman tried to get in?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly they ought to take care of the California students rather than send outside of the State and pay transportation charges for bringing them in.

Mr. SWING. Oh, they do not send outside of the State to get them. They come there of their own accord, many paying their own traveling expenses in order to get there.

Mr. Meritt said in testifying before the committee:

This is one of our best schools, and we feel that the Indian children are fortunate to have a school like this in which to get an education.

And the Indian children do feel just that way, and that is why there is a waiting list all the time. With this magnificent plant, with a wonderful record for efficiency and economy, we ought to be glad to avail ourselves of its usefulness by increasing its capacity without at all increasing its overhead expenses. I hope my amendment will prevail.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard in opposition to the amendment. I am very frank to admit it is difficult to oppose such an amendment, both because of the sincere zeal of the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING], who has urged the amendment not only on the floor but in personal conversation with the chairman of the subcommittee on several occasions, and in addition to that there is the recognition on the part of the subcommittee that this is one of the very good schools and that it is doing very good work. Of this school it was said a year ago by Mr. Meritt that if they had the money for repairs and improvements and additional construction, they could take care of 1,000 at a small additional cost. The attendance at that time at the school was 732. That was within the appropriation made at that time. The average attendance of the current year is 791, and the administration of the school should be given credit that with an appropriation for 750 pupils they have actually taken care of 791, and that at a per capita cost, as the gentleman says, below that authorized by law. The average cost is only \$168. They make a splendid showing. The present bill proposes an appropriation for 800, which is 50 more than the appropriation for the current year. It is only nine above the average attendance at the present time.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. SWING. That is an increase from 732 last year.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, yes; I get all of that.

Mr. SWING. And 791 this year, with no additional appropriation for the increase.

Mr. CRAMTON. I admit all of that. The present attendance is 791, and we are appropriating for 800, and we anticipate that they will have room for more than 800.

Now, it is true that if we give them \$40,000, as the gentleman proposes, they would pretty well fill up the school next year; if we gave them more they would fill it up, because we are not alone taking care of California there but we are taking care of the Navajos and other tribes as well. The gentleman has made comparison with other schools and talked about endowments and farms, and so forth. This school received from agricultural products raised on 146 acres \$21,812, and all of it goes to any purpose they want for the maintenance of that institution. In the Cherokee School, over in North Carolina, where they have a most remarkable per capita cost—and the gentleman referred to that school as having such a large income—the total value of the agricultural products raised there was \$5,314; the value of other products was \$1,905; and the amount received for labor was \$273.73.

Mr. SWING. What conclusion does the gentleman draw from the comparison of the two schools?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am simply emphasizing the fact that while a splendid showing has been made by the Sherman Institute a similar splendid showing has also been made by the Cherokee School and by other schools.

Now, the difficulty that confronted the Budget officers passing on this matter, and the difficulty that confronts the committee facing the problems of these schools, is that they all make appeals which we would like to grant, but there must be a sum total after all and there must be an apportionment between the schools, and we must face the fire of such gentlemen as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], who charges that the bill already is too large.

We must not unduly increase the amounts. They have 791 pupils now. We appropriate for 800. That is an increase really of 9, although I am frank to say that if we give them that they will have over 800 pupils in the school. I dare say that they have them packed pretty closely now. But, on the other hand, gentlemen are complaining that we are giving too much luxury to the Indians.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Having great confidence in the gentleman's good judgment, I would like to know whether he thinks those children are overcrowded? I am particular about that. I hope they are not overcrowded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may have five additional minutes.



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am sure that the management are packing them as closely as is conducive to good health. They are trying to take care of as many as they can. There is no evidence about their being packed in to an extent that is injurious to their health. The management are trying to get the most out of the money which the Government gives them.

Mr. SWING. Sixty were moved down from our end of the State, and the institution had no choice, but had to receive them.

Mr. CRAMTON. And the appropriation carried an extra amount to take care of them. I admit that they are crowded in as close as they ought to be, but not closer than is consistent with good health. There is no evidence to the contrary.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Are they crowded in as closely as they are in the public schools in Washington?

Mr. CRAMTON. That depends upon whose judgment you follow.

Mr. WINGO. It is not a question of judgment. It is a question of mathematics.

Mr. CRAMTON. It depends on whose mathematics. But let us take up the District bill when we come to it.

Mr. WINGO. It is a matter of comparison.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say that white children sometimes are pretty well crowded.

Mr. WINGO. If the children are crowded in these Indian schools as badly as the children are crowded in the city of Washington, I think we are treating them shamefully.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman does not mind, I would like to finish my statement.

Mr. Meritt states in the hearings that the \$15,000 covers also the construction of additional sleeping porches for the accommodation of the added number of pupils. The cost of the sleeping porches is \$5,000; and to be sure of what his understanding is, I talked with him this morning, and I am advised that if this \$15,000 is given they will find, in that \$15,000, \$5,000 for the construction of additional sleeping porches, and therefore the increase as anticipated will be taken care of, although not as fully as the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] or I myself would like.

Mr. CARTER. You will notice that the statement is that the approximate cost of the sleeping porches is \$5,000, which is to be taken from the \$15,000 appropriation?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. That is about the same proportion of increase for improvement that they allowed to the Phoenix school in the same climate where they have different conditions and where it is better for the children to sleep in sleeping porches than inside?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words for the purpose of asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BUTLER. What does the superintendent say about the crowded condition there? Does he make a request for this additional money?

Mr. CRAMTON. The superintendent asked for repairs and improvements, \$30,000; for new buildings, \$75,000; for equipment, gymnasium, and hospital, and so forth, \$15,000; purchase of additional land, \$75,000. That is the superintendent's idea. He evidently supports the \$15,000 anyway.

Mr. BUTLER. Does he speak especially of the crowded condition there?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have nothing on that, but I will state that it is admitted that the institution is filled up now, but they have a wonderful climate in California, and they will stand crowding.

Mr. BUTLER. There is none better.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition for the purpose of asking the chairman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. KETCHAM. Just a moment ago the chairman made reference to the total value of agricultural products at this Riverside school. We have been making some comparisons, based on the value of these agricultural productions per acre at each Indian school, and I find that this school at Riverside, Calif., their production is \$149.39 per acre, rather an unusual production. In contrast with that of the Cherokee Indian school in North Carolina they have \$106.06 per acre. How does the committee arrive at that? That is an unusual production.

Mr. CARTER. I suppose it is arrived at by setting down just exactly what was produced. But you can not always tell by the area how much the products will amount to.

Mr. KETCHAM. It is the quality of the area?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. The land may be better in one place than in another.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I can explain that in a nutshell. One is irrigated land, the other is not. Therefore one is more intensely cultivated, with a much better production than the other.

Mr. KETCHAM. The gentleman is not exactly clear about that, is he? Does he say the lands at Cherokee are irrigated?

Mr. CARTER. No; the lands at Riverside are irrigated.

Mr. KETCHAM. The production at Cherokee is larger than at Riverside.

Mr. CARTER. I thought the gentleman made the other statement.

Mr. KETCHAM. No. One is \$106.06 and the other \$149.39.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SWING) there were—ayes 9, noes 27.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 100 Indian pupils at the Fort Bidwell Indian School, Calif., including pay of superintendent, \$22,500; for general repairs and improvements, \$6,000; in all, \$28,500.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 36, line 3, strike out the figures "\$22,500," in line 3, page 36, and insert "\$24,000," and in line 4, page 36, strike out the figures "\$28,500" and insert the figures "\$30,000."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, this change of \$1,500 looks almost infinitesimal. It ought to be at least \$10,000 instead of that amount, at a very low estimate. There will be an increasing number of pupils at this school the coming year. The department in its estimate and in its statement before the committee urges that the amount of \$30,000 be allowed, \$24,000 for superintendent and maintenance and \$6,000 for repairs.

I want to say now in response to what was said yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma that I think the gentleman did not really mean what he said when he said that this is a very expensive school. The misfortune is that several of these schools are not like some of the larger ones, for which a great amount of money has been poured out. In this school, as in others that I know of, the superintendent gives at least half of his time, if not more, and the employees give about half of their time as agents outside of the schools, traveling over the district and the State, and at this particular school traveling over three States looking after the Indians' lands and the Indians' interests. So that ought not to be charged to the per capita of the school, although it is unjustly so charged. This school ought to have this amount, and I trust the committee will not oppose this slight increase.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. When we had the last amendment up I suggested to my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], in charge of the bill, that if these Indian schools were as crowded as the schools in the city of Washington they ought to have some relief. My friend suggested that that depended on whose judgment was taken. I am not taking the judgment of anybody on the question of the schools of the District of Columbia. I am basing my conclusions upon a personal knowledge, mathematical and mechanical, as well as a general survey of the schools of the District of Columbia. Of course, we are what might be called a city council for the District of Columbia. Nobody can ever accuse me of partiality for the District of Columbia, but candor compels me to admit that every time I look into the school situation in the District of Columbia I blush with shame.

The schools in this District are not taken care of as they should be. I think I know some of the reasons why they are not. It is a reflection upon Congress that we permit the condition to exist that does exist here. The facilities are inadequate and the schools in every way might be improved by a proper recognition of the problems and by proper appropriations, and by a businesslike constructive program extending over a term of years. I say that not only from the standpoint of business judgment but as one who has given a good deal of study to education. I have taken a great deal of interest in it. I have taught school myself and I am always interested in the public-



school system anywhere. I state, as my judgment based upon a personal study of the school system in the city of Washington, that it is a shame and a disgrace that Congress does not treat the schools of this District better than it does.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, speaking in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], the maximum per capita cost for pupils at these Indian schools is \$250 for schools of the size of the institution in question and \$225 for the larger schools. The Indian Service, however, has been able to administer these schools so economically that they are being maintained upon a per capita cost of \$200 for schools of the larger size and \$225 for schools of this size, and this bill is framed upon that basis, except in the case of two or three schools in the extreme north where, naturally, the cost of fuel and so forth is greater during the winter. Schools in North Dakota and Montana, I think, are the only exceptions. The schools in California are based on a per capita cost of \$225 for the smaller ones, and the committee has therefore cut the budget estimate as to this school, where there are only 100 pupils appropriated for, to conform to that general policy. The sum of \$22,500 allows them the same amount proportionately as is carried for other small boarding schools through the country. In addition to that, this school, which is a small one, has \$6,000 coming in from the operation of its farm, and that is also used for the support and maintenance of the school.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RAKER. Did the gentleman have anything before the committee to show the amount of work performed by the superintendent and officers of this school in the handling of Indian property and disposing of materials of the Indians outside of the school?

Mr. CRAMTON. Is it the purpose to give this \$1,500 increase to the superintendent?

Mr. RAKER. No; it is for the general business of the school.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then I think that matter is quite immaterial. I have no information on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 36, between lines 4 and 5, add as a new paragraph the following:

"For support and education of 100 Indian pupils at the Greenville School, California, including pay for superintendent, \$24,000; for general repairs and improvements, \$4,000; for repair of school building on account of and by reason of the fire of December 17, 1921, to be immediately available, \$80,000; in all, \$88,000."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] has presented a good statement in regard to the Riverside School. A part of the pupils from the Greenville School went there and are there at present. They are not appropriated for. I have looked over the provision for the school at Carson and there is no provision for them there. I visited that school, went over there to look at it, and spent some little time there. No provision is made for them at the schools in Oregon and none in the other schools in California.

It was stated positively, and the Record will show it was stated, that they were going to transfer these pupils to the Bidwell Indian School and improve the Bidwell School and give additional buildings and equipment so as to provide for them there. They have not done so. They have made no provision for these Indian children. When the deficiency bill was up June 23, 1922, I presented an amendment which was ruled out on a point of order. At that time I showed that there are 28 public buildings—I want to call this particularly to the attention of the subcommittee and the committee—28 public buildings unused, standing idle. The valuation of this property was \$250,000. There are 320 acres of Government land not estimated in value but probably worth \$15,000, a good farm and good equipment. We have had already in the bill provision for sleeping porches, \$10,000 or \$20,000, and gymnasiums. Here is a school, and I care not who makes the report, I know that nobody has been there except perhaps some subagent. They may write to the committee and make statements, but I know that nobody has been there with authority, except, perhaps, Mr. Pierce may have been there, but nobody else. None of the committee is personally familiar with it. Everybody in the community is desirous of having the building destroyed by fire on December 21 rebuilt.

The people in the community that have the lumber are willing to turn it over at cost to the Government so that the building can be built without delay. Now, these Indians live within a small radius of this school building. I have been familiar with that for many years. Years ago I worked in the Indian valley in haying and the harvest fields. I am familiar with the Indians who live there, their condition. I know you can paint a beautiful picture of the school at Carlisle. I have been there. You can describe the surroundings of the school at Riverside, and there is no better place on earth. I have helped take Indians there when I was on the bench to give the girls a better consideration rather than turning them out loose. I have seen the schools in Oregon and Nevada.

This is a school where there are 70 to 100 pupils. The climatic conditions are the best, there are fine surroundings, where the children can go home and visit their parents and come back again. Thirty years ago they had no houses there but only wickiups.

To-day some have very good homes and outbuildings. They have automobiles and are trying to become civilized, working up. Now, because you will not give \$25,000 or \$30,000 for a new building you are to abandon the property you have. You take these little Indian boys and girls from their parents and send them—the nearest location 700 miles away—to schools scattered over four different States. I appeal to this committee: Is it right, is it proper, is it just? It may be that some special reason is being exerted to prevent this building from being erected. I can not believe it. Both Senators from California are desirous of securing this building. Every member of the congressional delegation from California and the people of the community, public officials, superintendent of schools of the State of California, the board of charity and corrections, that have visited the place, all unite in a desire for this building.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. I know of no more worthy cause, no more worthy purpose. I know of no place where this amount of money could be so well expended with as much advantage as it can be to build this building that can be put up in two months and give these Indians an opportunity for a better education. Education as I speak of it now in this school and all these schools is not simply book learning but an education so that the Indian can go out and make a living when he gets through his school.

Gentlemen, this school at Bidwell and Greenville, if I had the time to go into it minutely, to show you the benefits to the Indians, the advantages they derive from these schools, I know you would grant the request of these people.

Go out there and visit them now and you will see Indians grown up from little boys and girls dressed as they ought to be. They keep their persons in proper shape. Their health has increased 90 per cent, and it is by virtue of the instruction that they have received. It is by virtue of the surroundings of the schools, and in addition to that they have assisted people in the community, so that the young Indians are healthy and clean and do not have contagious and infectious diseases. These pupils go home and assist the men and women and other young Indians that are not going to school to get better results. These Indians are law-abiding, they are sober now—they never violated the law except when the white man interfered—and the community has been benefited by these schools. I trust that the committee will see its way clear at this time to provide for the destroyed buildings, which the Indians were not responsible for, but one of pure accident.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has offered an amendment for the repair of the buildings. The amendment is a subterfuge. What is sought is to put up a building to replace one destroyed by fire. It is in this language because otherwise it would be subject to a point of order which would have been made. The gentleman spoke about the value of the institution having been placed at \$230,000 or more. The report made to Congress last year, which is shown on page 289 of the hearings, gives the value of the plant at \$71,708, and subsequent to that time the principal building of the plant was destroyed.

The building housed the dormitory, the dining room, the kitchen, the clothing and school rooms. That is the building destroyed by fire, and it does not say partially destroyed. That housed those principal activities of the school. It is safe to



say that most of the \$71,000 of valuation was destroyed by the fire. That having occurred, the committee was impressed a year ago, and the Indian Service took the same position, that it was the proper occasion for the consolidation of the school activities in the larger schools in that part of the country, the cost per capita being less, and, on the other hand, there are the benefits which the child receives because of the larger schools, there is a better morale, and the results are better generally. The committee did not last year provide for the rebuilding of the school, and I trust the House will not do so now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAKER) there were—ayes 12, noes 11.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan demands tellers. Those in favor of ordering tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Eighteen Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 350 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Mount Pleasant, Mich., and for pay of superintendent, \$79,000; for general repairs and improvements, \$12,000; in all, \$91,000.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling to the attention of the committee some facts which I have worked out in connection with one item that appears in the report of the committee in respect to every one of these schools mentioned in the report, namely, the production per acre of agricultural products. I think a comparative table of these figures will be of interest. I give them for the various schools noted in the report.

Beginning with Arizona, at the Fort Mojave School, it amounted to \$58.33; at the Phoenix School it amounted to \$99.97; at the Truxton Canyon School, \$103.86. In California, at the Riverside School it amounted to \$149.39; at the Fort Bidwell School, \$47.51. In Kansas, at the Haskell Institute it amounted to \$60.31. In Michigan, at the Mount Pleasant School it amounted to \$96.85. In Minnesota, at the Pipestone School it amounted to \$32.26. In Nebraska, at the Genoa School it amounted to \$48.89; and in Nevada, at the Carson City School it amounted to \$17.05. In New Mexico, at the Albuquerque School, \$195.86; and at the Santa Fe School, \$137.46. In North Carolina, at the Cherokee School, \$166.06; and in North Dakota, at the Bismarck School, \$39.50; at the Fort Totten School, \$30.21; at the Wahpeton School, \$23.61. In Oklahoma, at the Chilocco School it amounted to \$6.15, and at the Cherokee Orphan School, \$26.31. In Oregon, at the Salem School it amounted to \$32.72; and in South Dakota, at the Flandreau School, \$71.48; at the Pierre School, \$31.26; at the Rapid City School, \$11.41. In Wisconsin, at the Hayward School it amounted to \$30.16, and at the Tomah School, \$41.61. In Wyoming, at the Shoshone School it amounted to \$4.83.

The extremes will prove interesting. The lowest production per acre was in Wyoming, at the Shoshone School, where it was \$4.83; and the highest in New Mexico, at the Albuquerque School, \$195.86. Striking an average of them all, it appears to me that the showing from the standpoint of agriculture is a very satisfactory one and indicates that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is giving attention to a very vital and important proposition in teaching these Indians how to conduct their agricultural enterprises successfully.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Can the gentleman give me the figures upon the Sac and Fox School in Iowa, which is in my district?

Mr. KETCHAM. I regret that I am unable to do so, because the figures for that school are not given in the report, and that was the source of my information. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MADDEN having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was presented by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On December 20, 1922:

H. R. 11040. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916.

On December 27, 1922:

H. R. 12174. An act to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga.,

to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary; and

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921.

On December 28, 1922:

H. R. 3034. An act for the relief of Lizzie Askell;

H. R. 5349. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels;

H. R. 7912. An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case; and

H. R. 8996. An act to amend section 5211 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For promoting civilization and self-support among the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, \$110,000, to be paid from the principal sum on deposit to the credit of said Indians, arising under section 7 of the act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," approved January 14, 1889, to be used exclusively for the purposes following: Not exceeding \$35,000 of this amount may be expended for general agency purposes; not exceeding \$15,000 may be expended, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, in aiding in the construction, equipment, and maintenance of additional public schools in connection with, and under the control of, the public-school system of the State of Minnesota, said additional school buildings to be located at places contiguous to Indian children who are now without proper public-school facilities, said amount to be immediately available; not exceeding \$15,000 may be expended in aiding indigent Chippewa Indians upon the condition that any funds used in support of a member of the tribe shall be reimbursed out of and become a lien against any individual property of which such member may now or hereafter become seized or possessed, and the Secretary of the Interior shall annually transmit to Congress at the commencement of each regular session a complete and detailed statement of such expenditures, the two preceding requirements not to apply to any old, infirm, or indigent Indian, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior; not exceeding \$45,000 may be expended for the support of the Indian hospitals.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I do that for the purpose of calling attention to the situation arising from this provision which I believe will result in the Government being required to pay back some millions of dollars which have been taken from the tribal funds in violation of law. The provision here is for promoting civilization and self-support among the Chippewa Indians, \$110,000, to be paid from the principal sum on deposit to the credit of said Indians arising under section 7 of the act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," approved January 14, 1889. The Committee on Indian Affairs some time ago held extended hearings on the Chippewa Indian matters and found a most complicated and involved condition due to bureau control. One or two things stood out clear and distinct, however. One is that the act of 1889 prohibits Congress from appropriating money from the tribal funds of this tribe for the purpose of maintaining officials of the Indian Bureau and for administrative expenses on the reservation. Section 7 of that act reads as follows:

That all money accruing from the disposal of said lands in conformity with the provisions of this act shall, after deducting all the expenses of making the census, of obtaining the cession and relinquishment, of making the removal and allotments, and of completing the surveys and appraisals, in this act provided, be placed in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of all the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota as a permanent fund, which shall draw interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, payable annually for the period of 50 years, after the allotments provided for in this act have been made, and which interest and permanent fund shall be expended for the benefit of said Indians in manner following: One-half of said interest shall during the said period of 50 years, except in the cases hereinafter otherwise provided, be annually paid in cash in equal shares to the heads of families and guardians of orphan minors for their use; and one-fourth of said interest shall during the same period and with the like exception be annually paid in cash in equal shares per capita to all other classes of said Indians; and the remaining one-fourth of said interest shall during the said period of 50 years, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, be devoted exclusively to the establishment and maintenance of a system of free schools among said Indians in their midst and for their benefit, and at the expiration of the said 50 years the said permanent fund shall be divided and paid to all of said Chippewa Indians and their issue then living in cash in equal shares: *Provided*, That Congress may in its discretion from time to time during the said period of 50 years appropriate for the purpose of promoting civilization and self-support among the said Indians a portion of said principal sum not exceeding 5 per cent thereof.

We have had for some years past a provision in the bill taking out of the tribal funds large sums, running up to as high as \$180,000, for the support and civilization of the Indians and the maintenance of the employees and administrative expenses. It has always been held by the Indians involved that this was not a rightful charge against the tribal funds. Millions have been taken from the tribal funds, which have been



cut in two, and certainly some day a claim will lie. A provision in this item I seek to strike out provides a sum of money for schools. There is some \$50,000 now being spent out of this interest on these Chippewa funds. There is provision here that \$35,000 shall be spent for agency expenses, every dollar of it unwarranted, and I believe in violation of the act of 1889, and the claim will lie against the Government for every dollar of this expenditure, extending over the years since 1911. The intent of the act was that at the end of 50 years the principal should be divided among the then living members of the tribe. If the present policy is continued they will be turned loose as paupers, with only a memory of past riches.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, this is an appropriation bill; but after a provision upon it is passed by the Congress authorizing certain tribal funds to be expended, is not that authority of law for that expenditure; and where it is so authorized now in the years to come could they come back and say that there was no authority of law for the expenditure?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. There is surely no authority to carry items on appropriation bills which violate a law on the statute books.

Mr. BLANTON. To that extent would it not be a repeal of that law?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That question has not been decided judicially, to my knowledge. The Supreme Court did have a phase of this question before it some years ago. In 1915, on the 4th of March, a resolution was passed through this House carrying on the appropriations for the year previous by general resolution. One of the Chippewa Indians took the matter to court, and that court held that Congress by a general resolution could not detail this appropriation in the bill, but it was appealed to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court decided that by general resolution this appropriation could be continued, but the question of the power of Congress to appropriate from these tribal funds for administrative purposes was not decided.

The question as to whether Congress had the power to take the tribal funds in violation of a specific statute was not at issue, although it has been stated before the Committee on Indian Affairs that it was in question. I maintain that this appropriation of \$110,000 is unnecessary, in view of the fact that some \$250,000 is available from interest on the tribal funds, and the act itself provides how this sum can be expended. By striking it out you will do no injury to the Indians, and at the same time we make sure that there shall not be any claims on the part of these Indians against the Government for this sum in addition to the amount already involved in these appropriations. The Chippewas have the right to have the act of 1889 carried out as written and as it was explained to them by the commissioners. The commissioners agreed that it would not be so used, and it should not be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEENERSON: Page 40, at the end of line 24, strike out the period and insert a comma and add the following: "at the Red Lake, Croquet, and White Earth."

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain the reason for this amendment. Up to last year the agency for the Chippewas of Minnesota was at White Earth, and there were erected there numerous buildings, including a very fine and practically new hospital, with full equipment and furniture and everything to accommodate those people. The agency being moved to Leech Lake, quite a long distance away, about 100 miles away, these buildings have been abandoned.

Now, there are on White Earth Reservation something like 7,000 or 8,000 Indians, and many of them are very poor. Many of them, of course, are well to do. But owing to the peculiar theories of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] having been carried out one year, by which the appropriations were taken away from the agency at White Earth, they received no medical attention, and the condition is very bad among the poor Indians.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows that as to the \$25,000 which has been carried for the three hospitals

there, two of them have been discontinued and the money spent for one?

Mr. STEENERSON. I went to the White Earth Reservation last October. I met a great many people there. I saw this hospital, which is in splendid condition, even to the beds and bedclothes and furniture and everything, although it has been closed for a year. They were complaining that there were scores of sick people that needed hospitalization a few miles away. I at once sent a telegram to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs requesting that this hospital be opened. I sent a similar telegram to the President of the United States and explained that there was real urgency, according to the evidence of scores of people that I met there at the White Earth Reservation, so called. The answer came in this way; here is the telegram:

Replying to your telegram of October 24, White Earth boarding school hospital closed as the result of reduced appropriation brought about by the activities of the Chippewa General Council and Attorney Ballinger.

That is the result of carrying out the theory of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the bill already accomplishes what the gentleman wants.

Mr. STEENERSON. It may, but I want to make it sure. If I may be permitted, I want to explain this. I think I am entitled to the opportunity to do it. I read further:

We are asking in our estimate for increased Chippewa appropriations so that White Earth, Fond du Lac, and Red Lake hospitals may be operated for the benefit of the Indians. If these appropriations are made immediately available White Earth hospital can be opened as soon as Congress passes the Interior Department appropriation bill. We will appreciate your cooperation in procuring the necessary appropriation.

The whole telegram is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 24, 1922.

HON. HALVOR STEENERSON,  
Detroit, Minn.:

Your telegram October 24. White Earth boarding school and hospital closed as result of reduced appropriations brought about by activities of Chippewa General Council and Attorney Ballinger. No appropriations now available for operating White Earth hospital. We are asking in our estimates for increased Chippewa appropriations so that White Earth, Fond du Lac, and Red Lake hospitals may be operated for benefit of Indians. If these appropriations are made immediately available White Earth hospital can be opened as soon as Congress passes Interior Department appropriation bill. Will appreciate your cooperation in procuring necessary appropriations.

E. B. MERITT,  
Acting Commissioner.

Now, then, I got a letter to the same effect—that the appropriations were not sufficient. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has got the estimates there, and I think they show that the appropriation for 1922 was \$20,000. They only used a little over \$9,000, so they had over \$10,000 unexpended balance of that item for that year. If they spend the same amount for the current year they will have enough to run both hospitals the balance of this fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. It shows an appropriation of \$20,000, and they spent \$9,000. That is for the current year—1923. If the expenditures for this year are the same as those of the year before, then there would be the difference between \$17,500 and \$9,000 available for the opening of the White Earth hospital. But although there was an absolute emergency there to my certain knowledge—being right on the spot when I telegraphed to the department—they answered that the appropriations were not sufficient. They have had \$17,500, yet the record here before the committee shows that they used only \$9,000 for the hospital, and you have the difference between \$9,000 and \$17,000, or \$8,000, to run the hospital at White Earth for a few months the rest of this fiscal year.

Now, the money provided in this bill will not be available for opening the White Earth hospital until the 1st of July next. I intend to offer another amendment to make the money immediately available. I am specifying three places where Mr. Meritt, in his statement before the committee, says he intends to use this money. He says it is for the Cloquet, Red Lake, and White Earth hospitals. I presume he intends to do that. But for the satisfaction of the people there, where there are many Indians suffering for lack of hospital treatment, it



should be specifically stated, because in the current year and the year before there was a lump-sum appropriation for these hospitals and they used the money for only one.

There could be no objection to specifying here that this \$45,000 provided in this bill shall be for maintenance of the hospital at Red Lake, where they have one, and at Cloquet, where the commissioner says he is going to maintain one, and where there is a hospital that is vacant and that could be continued in operation, and at White Earth, where the hospital is fully equipped to take care of the people by just putting in the help.

Mr. BURTNESS. I saw the hospital and the Government buildings there on the Indian reservation a few months ago, and I was just wondering if the gentleman could give us any information with reference to the closing of the school on that reservation. They have splendid school buildings, and, if I were correctly informed, the school has been closed for a year or two.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; that is true, and the only reason why we have not made any effort in this Congress to change that situation is that they are negotiating with the State authorities for the disposal of that school. There is a school there that cost probably \$50,000, and there are some 600 acres of land connected with it. If the legislation already enacted is not sufficient, I should like to have a provision inserted in this bill authorizing the sale. However, the bill of a year ago, I think, carried sufficient authority for the sale, but the State authorities have not carried out that proposition, because they claimed that the legislature of Minnesota must first take action, which, it is expected, they will take next month when they meet in biennial session. That is the reason why that school still stands vacant.

Mr. BURTNESS. Is it the intention to convert it into a State school and sell it to the State?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes. The appropriation bill a year ago, I think, carried authority for the United States to transfer this school property and the land connected with it to the State of Minnesota for school purposes and other public purposes, and the State of Minnesota is now going to enact a law that will enable them to do so.

I hope that the amendment will be carried so that it will relieve these people from the anxiety which they now suffer.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is entirely unnecessary. The language of the current law, as the gentleman stated, was broad enough to have permitted a portion of the \$17,500 to be spent at any of the three hospitals named. It is being spent only at the Red Lake hospital, because a year ago, when they asked for the \$17,500, it was expressly stated that it was for the hospital at Red Lake and not for the other two; and so good faith required the Indian Bureau to spend it for the one where they stated it would be spent.

Mr. STEENERSON. Why did they represent to me that they had not any appropriation when they had \$17,500, which is nearly twice as much as they spent for that one hospital last year?

Mr. CRAMTON. Because in good faith they could not spend it anywhere except at Red Lake, where they said they were going to spend it.

Mr. STEENERSON. There was no such provision in the act. It was for the support of Indian hospitals in Minnesota generally.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; but there was an understanding with Congress, and good faith required them to keep that understanding.

Mr. STEENERSON. Then people must die for want of care because of a secret understanding with the committee?

Mr. CRAMTON. As a matter of fact the whole trouble has been that they have been hollering around that they did not want the money spent for this purpose, and because of that attitude on their part we shut up two of the hospitals, and they have been hollering ever since to get them opened again; and it has taken some time to do it. Now, this year the Indian Bureau have evidenced their good faith by asking for an increased appropriation for this purpose.

Their statement is that the item of \$45,000 for Indian hospitals is \$25,500 more than that authorized therefor for the current fiscal year (\$17,500). This appropriation was for only one hospital, viz, that at Red Lake, the hospitals formerly operated at Cloquet and White Earth having been discontinued. However, the Indians themselves have asked that these two hospitals be reopened and that the expense thereof be paid from their tribal funds, in view of the lack of other adequate facilities of this nature. Under the circumstances it is desired to reestablish the hospitals at Cloquet and White Earth, which explains the increase in the amount requested for such purposes. So that if the bill passes as now written,

without the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, the two hospitals in which he is interested will be reopened and cared for out of the \$45,000, and the gentleman's amendment will be mere surplusage.

Mr. STEENERSON. Then we are reduced to this situation: We have got to depend upon a private agreement between the committee and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs instead of depending upon what is written in the law.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; there was an express agreement between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Congress of which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] is a most honored Member.

Mr. STEENERSON. Therefore the gentleman thinks we ought to leave this matter in doubt. Why should we have to depend upon such an agreement with the committee? Let us put it right in the law saying that these three hospitals which they say they are going to reestablish shall be provided for so as to relieve the anxiety of the people on White Earth Reservation and the other reservation. It can not hurt anything to put it into the law, instead of having a private agreement with the chairman of the subcommittee which the Indians up there do not know anything about.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the chairman in charge of the bill [Mr. CRAMTON] if this bill passes, the appropriations, of course, will not be available until the 1st of next July? Where is there any provision here making the appropriation mentioned by the gentleman immediately available?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is no such provision, and there is none in the pending amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, that being the case, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, who has been sitting here patiently all day long waiting for this item to come up, so that he could have this hospital provided for, is right about it.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; the gentleman proposes to offer such an amendment, but has not offered it yet.

Mr. STEENERSON. I said I was going to offer it.

Mr. CRAMTON. What I have been saying is in relation to the pending amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. And when the gentleman from Minnesota offers the other amendment, then the gentleman from Michigan is going to crucify that also, is he?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know. We have not reached that yet.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman would not object to that, then?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am discussing the amendment which is before the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. The point is simply this: The gentleman from Minnesota says these hospitals are closed up, that they are needed, and he wants them reopened now, and he says that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has promised him that if he would help make the money available in this bill he would reopen them. The gentleman from Minnesota is seeking to do that very thing. If he fails in doing it, the hospitals are going to remain closed. So I think there is a good deal of merit in what the gentleman from Minnesota is saying, and I think there ought to have been a provision inserted in this bill making this money immediately available, so that they can be opened up now, and not wait until next July.

Mr. BURTNESS. Possibly there is some arrangement between the subcommittee and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs so that they may be opened up.

Mr. BLANTON. I will admit that the subcommittee is practically all powerful, that it has unlimited power, but it can not by private agreement with anyone make this money available unless it is so stated in this bill. It has to be specified in the bill; they can not have a secret understanding that money appropriated shall become available before next July. It has to be written into the bill, and the gentleman from Minnesota has been here long enough to know it, and that is why he is now fighting for this proposition. I think the money ought to be made available, and I trust that his amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to modify my amendment by adding "which sum is to be immediately available."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that he may modify his amendment as reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment by Mr. STEENERSON: Page 40, at the end of line 24, strike out the period and insert a comma and add the following words: At Red Lake, Cloquet, and White Earth, which sum is to be immediately available.



Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment in its original form was not objectionable, but it was unnecessary. In its present form it makes available for use this year \$45,000 that was estimated as necessary for three hospitals next year. I hope in that form it will not be adopted.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will modify it so as to provide that \$15,000 be made immediately available for the White Earth hospital.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would leave only \$30,000 for the three hospitals next year. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. STEENERSON. They are dying there for the want of this hospital service.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh no; they wanted the hospital closed at one time, and it was closed in response to their clamor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEENERSON) there were 9 ayes and 13 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, in his discretion, the sum of \$35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the principal sum on deposit to the credit of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota arising under section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889, and to expend the same for payment of tuition for Chippewa Indian children enrolled in the public schools of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There has been a good deal said here about the policy in regard to Indian affairs, and I think that the situation in Minnesota is a pretty good object lesson on that subject. A great many in Minnesota shared the view of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] that the way to civilize the Indians was to release them from all Government restrictions in the control and management of their property. That was done in the case of mixed-blood Indians on the reservation in 1910 or 1911. The amendment was put on in the Senate as a rider on the Indian appropriation bill and agreed to in conference, so there was no opportunity to vote upon it in the House. So it became the law, and it released the mixed-blood Indians from the restrictions as to the alienation of land. They had before that been allotted valuable land in 80-acre tracts, some worth \$15,000 and some running down to \$1,000. There was a lumber company there that had employed the leaders to help acquire the land that had been allotted. The speculators went in there and took advantage of these mixed-blood Indians, many of whom were entirely incompetent. The greatest Indian fraud and scandal ever known in the Northwest resulted.

Some time thereafter when the department woke up to the situation there were 1,100 or 1,200 lawsuits started to set aside the title to land which had been acquired for little or nothing through fraud and deceit from these people. Many Indians claimed to be mixed blood that were not in order to sell their allotments for what they could get. Many were swindled out of all they had and are now poor and in distress. It was the theory advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that they ought to be let loose from Government control that was their undoing. On the other hand, the Red Lake Indians, who were by far the least advanced, have never been relieved of restrictions, still own their land, and are now better off than the others.

They have their own property, they are advanced greatly in agriculture and industry, and they are doing well. There is little disease among them, whereas among the others the reverse is true. The Minnesota board of health investigated the situation for fear it would have to be taken care of by the State. Here you have an object lesson of the working of the theory advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He wants to remove restrictions on all. The test of the thing is and ought to be, are they competent? No one knowing the Indians, the half-blood or the mixed blood, would claim that they should be relieved from Government restrictions unless they are reasonably able to take care of their own affairs. The clamor here was that when a man was mixed blood, when he was a half-blood, he ought to be turned loose, and he was turned loose. But he was not competent. Some of them got a fair price for their land and some of them just about gave it away. Some fooled it away in a few days. Some gambled it away. One Indian, who had received a large sum, wanted to ride in state, so he went to town and bought a hearse and sat down in it and rode through the town showing that he was as big as any white man. [Laughter.] That shows that he was not competent to take care of his own affairs.

These gentlemen who are philosophizing so much about the Indians ought to go and get acquainted with them before they

lay down general rules on that subject. There is no question but that there are many, probably two-thirds of the White Earth Indians, counting full bloods and mixed bloods all together, that are now competent to take care of their property as well as the average white man, and they should be released from Government restrictions. But Indians who have large tribal property interests should be given control only gradually as they demonstrate their competency.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The gentleman from Minnesota is familiar with some things in the Chippewa case, but if he had gone further and made a study of the White Earth investigation he would find there reasons for the scandals that arose in the action of the employees of the bureau in administering the law.

Here is what the House Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department during the Sixty-second Congress had to say about the situation to which the gentleman has referred. They made a most thorough investigation and published the results in two large volumes, known as House Report No. 1336. I commend it to the consideration of the gentleman:

These White Earth Indians, the remnant of the once powerful Chippewa Nation, are rapidly succumbing to the effects of extreme poverty and the white man's diseases and, betrayed by their lawful guardian and their mixed-blood relatives, are now despoiled of their heritage.

It is indeed a sad commentary upon the administration of the Interior Department, and more particularly upon the Indian Bureau, that notwithstanding the fact that they have about \$4,000,000 in the United States Treasury and that millions of their own have already been spent ostensibly for their relief and civilization, the condition of a very large part of the tribe is far worse than when the first treaty was concluded with them at Fort McIntosh in 1785.

The Chippewa Indians of Minnesota are not released. I pointed out yesterday the difference between the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota and the Chippewa Indians of Michigan, who are released. The Chippewa Indians of Michigan have not had a dollar out of the Government Treasury since 1872. They are Americans owning their own property, unfettered, and free. Two-thirds of them own their own homes. They have township supervisors. They have county officials. They are not under the bureau; but here is a tribe, the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, who now have in the Treasury of the United States some four or five million dollars, and they are being pauperized and kept in leading strings on these reservations, although it was the intention of the Congress to turn them loose.

The gentleman is mistaken in his idea that they are released from control. If you were to take the Indians in this country and divide up the property which they own as a race, every Indian family would have \$15,000. Suppose some of them, after being released, should stumble and fall on the upward climb; that is not an indication that all of them should be kept serfs under a debasing system of dependency.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is one dollar appropriated in this bill out of the Treasury of the United States for the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. This item is out of the tribal funds, and is in violation of law.

Mr. STEENERSON. It is their own money.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. They are still under the Indian Bureau. The result is that you have a people up there who are living in uncertainty. If they had been turned loose they would be to-day in the position of the Chippewas of Michigan, absolutely free, American citizens.

Mr. STEENERSON. This bill contains an appropriation of \$500 for the Indians of Michigan out of their trust funds, and further along another provision out of the trust funds. Giving the man his own money is not pauperizing him.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; that is exactly what I contend. Give his own to him and let him go. There is a gratuity in this bill of \$62,000 for the Indians of Minnesota. There is a treaty item running up to almost \$200,000 more. My argument is that they are not out from under the jurisdiction of this system. If they had been, they would have been in the situation of the Chippewas of Michigan, who are brothers in blood, but who are free, and who are self-supporting and self-respecting American citizens. I would like to see the experiment tried on the White Earth and the Red Lake Reservations in Minnesota. In 1889 the Congress ordered that the Red Lake Reservation should be allotted, but no allotment has been made. The reservation is still a center of tribalism, although a generation ago Congress ordered it divided into homesteads for the individuals.

Mr. BURTNES. By what reasoning does the gentleman arrive at the conclusion that the Indians on the White Earth Reservation would be better able to handle their own funds if they were distributed to them?



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am sorry that I have not time to answer the question of the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 200 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., including pay of superintendent, \$45,000; for general repairs and improvements, \$7,000; in all, \$52,000.

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLAGUE: Page 41, lines 11 and 12, strike out all of line 11 after the word "superintendent" and all of line 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$47,000; for general repairs and improvements, \$8,000; in all, \$55,000."

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this school at Pipestone is one of the main schools in the State for taking care of Indian children. As stated here, the school at White Earth has been discontinued. There are applications now at Pipestone from more than 300 children to attend the school. In my own county there are at least 20 Indian children who can not attend this school because there is not room for them. At the present time there are attending the Pipestone School 230 children. There are applications to make the attendance 300. Personally, I know this school and its surroundings. They have buildings there worth nearly \$200,000. With an appropriation of \$8,000 for repairs and improvements there could be additional room made to take care of at least 250 pupils, to take care of a number of pupils that should attend the school that are not attending a school anywhere. It is stated in the report of the committee that they educate children up to the eighth grade. That is not the fact. They are carried only through the sixth grade, and those of the sixth grade go to Flandreau and to other schools. There have been two additional teachers added to this school within the last year, but there is no room for them to carry on the school work. I visited this school during the last six months twice. It is located in my district, and I know it is in need of the money to carry on the school work. It will be an actual loss not to appropriate more for general repairs. More room is needed to take care of the Indian children that do not have a chance to go to school anywhere.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the allowance granted—\$45,000—is above the allowance granted through the bill for schools of 200 and more in attendance. Some allowance is due to the need for more fuel, and so forth, than in the southern schools, but having given the \$25 per capita above what is given schools generally of that same size, the committee does not feel that we should go any further in the direction the gentleman suggests, and we hope the item will not be further increased.

Mr. CLAGUE. Does not the gentleman think there should be room made for children that ought to go to that school who are in that vicinity who have no school facilities anywhere?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLAGUE) there were—ayes 7, noes 10.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the necessary surveys and enrolling and allotting the homeless nonremoval Mille Lac Indians in Minnesota, to whom allotments have not heretofore been made, on lands purchased for that purpose in accordance with authority granted in paragraph 3, section 8, of the Indian appropriation act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat., pp. 582-591), \$10,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, line 5, after the word "paragraph," strike out the figure "3" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "4."

Mr. CRAMTON. This is simply to correct a clerical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### MISSISSIPPI.

For the relief of distress among the full-blood Choctaw Indians of Mississippi, including the pay of one special agent, who shall be a physician, one farmer, and one field matron, and other necessary administration expenses, \$10,000; for their education by establishing, equipping, and maintaining day schools, including the purchase of land and the construction of necessary buildings and their equipment, \$21,500; for the purchase of lands, including improvements thereon, not exceeding 80 acres for any one family, for the use and occupancy of said Indians, to be expended under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for its repayment to the United States under such rules and regulations as he may direct, \$4,000; for the

purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among said Indians and to aid them in building homes, in the culture of fruits, grain, cotton, and other crops, \$8,000; which sum may be used for the purchase of seed, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to enable said Indians to become self-supporting, to be expended under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary for its repayment to the United States on or before June 30, 1930; in all, \$43,500.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOWREY: Page 42, line 16, after the word "equipment," add the following: "under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in connection with and under the control of the public-school system of the State of Mississippi."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to make the point of order?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; I desire to make the point of order on the ground that the gentleman proposes to expend money for the operation of schools under the public-school system of his State, not under Government control. There is no law authorizing such an expenditure.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I followed the wording exactly, I think, of the provision which was passed in regard to Minnesota on page 40.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; the difference between the items as having any effect on the parliamentary situation is this: The Minnesota item is for the payment of tuition to public schools, and, of course, those public schools are a part of the public-school system of the State. The gentleman in his amendment proposes here that the Federal Government school shall become a part of the school system of the State of Mississippi.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will permit, all the items appropriating money for the Minnesota Chippewas are authorized by a special treaty, which has reference only to those tribes and none other.

Mr. HAYDEN. I would like to be heard, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me clearly in order, because Congress has authorized an appropriation for the education of Indians. Under the Snyder Act of 1921 the appropriations are authorized for general support, including education. The broad term "education" covers a public-school system, a private-school system, or any kind of school system that the Congress may make appropriations for in behalf of the Indians. Clearly to my mind under existing law, as carried out in the Snyder Act, this amendment is in order.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I call attention again to the fact that the language of the amendment is identical with the language just passed in the item in regard to Minnesota.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will permit, the item to which he refers is an item the authorization of which is provided by a special treaty with these particular Indians, and it applies only to the Chippewa Indians. Practically all the items in Minnesota are of that character. They are all in compliance with the treaties. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] will agree to that.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes. As a matter of fact, all the appropriations for Minnesota are made out of tribal funds, and not a dollar comes out of the Treasury.

Mr. CARTER. Yes. The appropriations in Minnesota are made out of the tribal funds and in pursuance of a special treaty with those tribes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs can put any Indian he desires in the public schools. He can put these Indians in Mississippi in the public schools without any authorization of law. The amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Lowrey] simply says he must work in connection with the public-school system in Mississippi. It seems to me in any case it is clearly in order.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman undertakes to go a little further than that, if the gentleman will permit. He undertakes to place the jurisdiction of the expenditure of this Federal money under State authority.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. But the Secretary of the Interior must also act in connection with the Mississippi system.

Mr. CARTER. I do not think the amendment quite states that. I think it places the expenditure of the funds and the jurisdiction of the children completely under State authority, without any joint control on the part of the Secretary. I would not be sure about that.



Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. It says "in connection with the Secretary."

Mr. LOWREY. If I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to put that under joint control. I would like to have an opportunity to discuss the merits of this particular situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan reserve his point of order?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman desires, I will reserve it for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan reserves his point of order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] for five minutes.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, the situation with reference to the Indians of Mississippi is just this: There are only about 1,100 of them, and I suppose it would involve only 400 or 500 educable children. For years, I might say for generations, they have lived right there with the white folks and the negroes. There are three races there. They are all mixed, and they are not segregated in any sense, and as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] knows, the Indians lost their opportunity for tribal lands in Oklahoma, and they are just there as Mississippians. I think they ought to be citizens of Mississippi, and ought to be taxpayers, and ought to be educated and dealt with just like the other two races in the State, and I would like to see them come to that condition. I would not favor making any appropriation to them if circumstances did not warrant it, but I think they should be educated just to be a part of "the folks." Their schools should be just like the other schools and under the same management.

Further, I know the superintendent of education in Mississippi and his assistants and his coworkers, and I consider that system one of the most efficient aggregations that I know of. They are interested in this proposition, and they can handle this situation better than anybody else.

Further, I do not want to enter into minute details, but there have arisen lately some complications, some prejudices with reference to the Government's handling of things there that are hurting the situation and will hurt it further the longer this thing stays in the hands of a Government bureau. The sooner those schools are put along with the other schools and under the same management and under the same board the better for those 1,100 Indians. Now, if this money could be expended for building under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, as stated, then wherever the schools could be run with the State schools the other system could be discontinued. I believe next year it could be abandoned entirely. I think those Indians should become citizens and part of the State.

But I think this move is heading that way, and I insist again that I have adopted the very wording used in another State. While one is a gratuity and the other out of tribal funds, it is all money for Indian education, and I see no reason why the distinction should apply in one case and not in the other. I shall be glad, if I may, to put in the words "under joint control." I want to bring these schools into the State educational system and to do it as soon as possible. I am sure it will be the very best thing for all concerned.

I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by inserting the words "under joint control."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. I reserve a point of order upon the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOWREY: Page 42, line 16, after the word "equipment" add the following: "Under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in connection with and under the joint control of the public-school system of the State of Mississippi."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan make a point of order?

Mr. CRAMTON. I desire to reserve it for a moment to make this one observation: There may be much merit in what is proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi. It may be a matter that should be worked out in concert with the officials having the responsibility and who are fully familiar with the facts. I do not think, however, that it is a good plan to go into something when we do not know just exactly what we are doing. Hence I feel obliged to oppose the amendment.

As to the parliamentary phase of the amendment, I make the point of order that the language, as it stands, providing for

joint control of Federal funds, is not permissible under existing law and is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, let me call the gentleman's attention to this: I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] has taken a step in the right direction; but as the gentleman from Michigan suggests, we do not want to take any step here that will do any violent damage to the thing that is at present being done for these people. I would suggest that what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] desires to accomplish may be accomplished by inserting after the word "equipment" in line 16 the words—

or for paying the tuition of full-blood Mississippi Choctaw Indians in the public schools.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Here is an appropriation which compels the erection of buildings for these schools. It provides that the money shall be spent for the erection of new buildings and the purchase of equipment that will not be necessary if the children are put in the public schools.

Mr. CARTER. It does not compel the building. It simply authorizes it.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows that will be done.

Mr. CARTER. I think they have built all the schools they will build. I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] will agree with me on that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma withhold his argument for a moment until we can have a ruling on the point of order?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, since the amendment has been modified by providing for joint control, it may be subject to a point of order, but the way the gentleman from Mississippi originally offered it I do not think it is subject to a point of order, for this reason: In practically all of the legislation up to the present time we have made provision for sending these Indians to day schools and public schools. That is positive legislation providing that they may be sent to the public schools. The gentleman made the argument awhile ago that we were doing that under the Snyder law. Now, when you direct the Secretary to send them to the public schools, do you not do just exactly what the gentleman is proposing to do here by his amendment?

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand the gentleman from California admits that the amendment is subject to the point of order.

Mr. RAKER. I think the amendment with the words "under joint control" is subject to the point of order. Yes, sir. But as the amendment was originally presented I have grave doubts of a point of order being successfully lodged against it. I just wanted to call the distinction to the Chair. I am afraid the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] has lost just what he is after by the amendment to the amendment which has been offered by him without objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi reads:

Under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in connection with and under joint control of the public schools of the State of Mississippi.

The point of order is made that this is legislation not authorized by existing law. The provision of the law under which it is claimed that this amendment may be authorized is the act of November 2, 1921. The provision of that law is that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall direct and supervise the expenditure of such money as Congress may from time to time appropriate for the benefit and care of the Indians throughout the United States for the following purposes: " \* \* \* General civilization, including education."

The members of the committee will understand that all of these general provisions must be placed under the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, under this law. There is no provision made for a division of control. It would be perfectly within the power of the Secretary of the Interior to direct that these children might be educated in the public schools. There would be no objection whatever to a provision in this law that if they were educated in the public schools it might be paid for out of the general fund or out of tribal funds. There would be no objection in either case. Still the disposition and control of the funds would be under the Secretary of the Interior. But this proposes to place the control partially at least



under the school authorities of the State of Mississippi. That is not authorized by existing law. For that reason the point of order is sustained.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOWREY: Page 42, line 16, after the word "equipment," insert "or for the tuition of full-blood Choctaw Indian children enrolled in the public schools."

Mr. CRAMTON. That amendment is satisfactory and the committee will accept it.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest that the word "Mississippi" be inserted before the word "Choctaw."

Mr. LOWREY. I ask unanimous consent that the word "Mississippi" be inserted according to the suggestion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOWREY. You have got all the land belonging to these Indians. You ought not to get all the school money, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOWREY: Page 42, line 16, after the word "equipment," insert "or for the tuition of full-blood Mississippi Choctaw Indian children enrolled in the public schools."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all purposes necessary for the proper drainage of the lands of the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico in the Rio Grande Valley, including the Pueblos of Cochiti, Santo Domingo, Santa Ana, Ranchitos purchase, Sandia, and Isleta, including cooperation with drainage districts formed or to be formed by others or draining the land by the Government direct, \$20,000, reimbursable in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I understand this paragraph, it is proposed to spend \$20,000 for the drainage of the lands of the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico in the Rio Grande Valley. Would it be advisable to spend that money there if the Bursum bill is passed and becomes a law?

Mr. CRAMTON. My information is that the Bursum bill has been interned in the committee from which it came, and that there will be no probability of its passage.

Mr. BUTLER. I hope the gentleman's information is correct, but the gentleman would not think it advisable to extend it if the bill was passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

For improvement, operation, and maintenance of the Hogback irrigation project on that part of the Navajo Reservation in New Mexico under the jurisdiction of the San Juan Indian School, \$7,500, reimbursable under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the chairman give us the information so that the country may know as to these reimbursable amounts to the reclamation funds? How do they get the consent of the Indians to do this work? I see that most of the items are reimbursable for irrigation work on Indian lands and take it out of the Indian fund.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is asking me for information which perhaps is far less valuable than his own. My understanding is that legally the consent of the Indian is not necessary. The authority to supervise their affairs by the Government makes it legally unnecessary to obtain their consent. I assume, however, as a practical question, that very generally the matter is worked out in cooperation with the views of the Indians who are interested. At any rate, there should be some sort of cooperation in order that money shall not be expended the benefits of which will not be realized by the Indians.

Mr. RAKER. I am asking in the best of good faith. These matters are so varied and so large that we can not get too much information about them. The point is that the Indian is getting the benefit by virtue of irrigation and will receive a splendid return for the money expended in his behalf?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to the gentleman that in this particular project before us the figures show that the activity is in accordance with the wishes of the Indians. The Indians do not always avail themselves of the land after it is irrigated, but in this case the amount that is actually irrigated on this project is 1,550 acres. Of that, 1,540 acres are cultivated by the Indians and only 10 acres by whites, which demonstrates

that this particular project is in accordance with the desire of the Indians.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a further answer to the gentleman's question, with all due regard to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I think it was a proper question to have been raised by the gentleman from California, and I think my answer will give him some information.

I remember in 1920 or 1921 I was a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs. I was asked by the chairman of the committee to make some investigation into the reimbursable appropriations for the use of irrigation projects. Now, while what the distinguished chairman said is true in regard to the law, the practice is that they do not consult the Indians. I know as a matter of fact and I know of many cases where the Indians, well-informed Indians, came before the subcommittee and complained that under the operation of the law permitting the use of tribal funds for irrigation purposes, under this so-called method of reimbursable legislation, that in many cases valuable allotments of 40, 80, 120, and 160 acres of land have been encumbered by more money than the land would sell for, because of the department spending large sums of money on these irrigation projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more in order that I may yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. I now yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RHODES. It is my opinion, and I think my distinguished friend [Mr. CARTER], who was present during a great many hearings, as was also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], will agree that it is not the practice to consult the Indians, and it is a matter of general complaint by many well-informed Indians.

Mr. RAKER. From the gentleman's observation, what was the conclusion that the committee came to as to whether or not the money expended was justified by reason of the value of the land and the location?

Mr. RHODES. I think in most cases it was not justified, but the committee was somewhat divided in opinion as to what the future policy should be. That situation was true, because the testimony that came before the committee from the Indian side of the case was not entirely in accord with the testimony that came before the committee from the officials representing the Indian Bureau. My personal opinion is that there had been an abuse of authority in this regard by the bureau, and my opinion further is, and I think it is borne out by the statement of the officials of the bureau, that it is very doubtful whether or not many of these great irrigation projects are practicable. The Government of the United States by law has undertaken to convert into agricultural land that by nature is not fit for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more, and then I will not trouble the committee further.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri this question: What is his opinion as a member of that committee, with his long experience as an attorney, as to whether or not, if the Indians should venture to raise the question on the facts stated, their land would be responsible and could it be taken to pay the expenses of the reclamation?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very doubtful in many cases whether or not the land of the Indian can be held liable for the amount expended. I was reading the report of the Attorney General for the fiscal year just closed, and I think there are some cases pending in the district courts of the United States now which involve this very question.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. If I have the floor; yes.

Mr. CARTER. As to the lands that had been allotted prior to the passage of the act, there might be some question; but as to lands that had not been allotted prior to the passage of the irrigation proposition the matter was clearly settled in two decisions, one the Lone Wolf decision, in southwest Oklahoma, and the other the Gritts case, in northeast Oklahoma, in which it was held that the Federal Government had plenary power to do as it saw fit in the capacity of guardian to ward in con-



nection with any properties retained in tribal ownership. I assume one of the reservations is with reference to the Blackfeet?

Mr. RHODES. Yes; and on the Flathead, too.

Mr. CARTER. I hold no brief for the Indian Bureau, but the Blackfeet irrigation project, as I recall, was put over by Congress without the consent of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. RHODES. Most of these propositions have been put over without the consent of the Indians.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I think I should make this statement for the benefit of the committee generally as to these irrigation projects for the Indians: It is the position of the Indian Service now—of the commissioner and the assistant commissioner—that there have been errors made in the taking up of some of these irrigation projects for the Indians, but what has been done can not now be undone. At the present time the Indian Service is not encouraging any new irrigation projects. It is simply continuing those that have heretofore been commenced and which must be completed in order not to have a complete loss.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 220 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., and pay of superintendent, \$49,500; for general repairs and improvements, including well and water system, \$9,000; in all, \$58,500.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTNESS: Page 51, line 8, after the word "system," strike out the figures "\$9,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and for the purchase of additional land, \$41,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment, that it is legislation not authorized by existing law.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, the Snyder Act has already been referred to several times. It was approved November 2, 1921. The amendment proposed comes clearly within the authorization of several provisions of that act. I think it would come within the first provision authorizing appropriations for the general support and civilization, including the education of the Indians. I think it would come within the provisions of the third subdivision, possibly, for industrial assistance and advancement, but if it should be held that it does not come within either the first or the third subdivisions, it is very plain that it comes within the provisions of the fifth, which reads as follows:

For the enlargement, extension, improvement, and repair of the buildings and grounds of existing plants and projects.

The only purpose of the new language in this amendment is to enlarge and extend the existing plant.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman has knowledge of the situation. The amendment which he offers does not show whether the land he proposes to acquire is contiguous to the existing plant. Will the gentleman state whether it is?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes; it is. I would be very glad to insert in my proposed amendment the word "contiguous."

Mr. CRAMTON. Under those conditions it would not be subject to the point of order, and if the gentleman states that is the condition, then I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, so that there may be no question about it, to modify my amendment by inserting the word "contiguous" before the word "additional."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota to so modify the amendment?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTNESS: Page 51, line 8, after the word "system," strike out the figures "\$9,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and for the purchase of contiguous additional land, \$41,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. At what page are the hearings on this particular matter?

Mr. BURTNESS. At page 395.

Mr. RAKER. And where does the statement of the gentleman appear in regard to this?

Mr. BURTNESS. I did not make a statement before the subcommittee. I did introduce a separate bill, H. R. 13199, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, covering the individual matter of buying additional land, but in asking for a hearing I was informed by the subcommittee that it would not hear anyone except such people as were interested in items that had come through the Budget estimates.

Inasmuch as this item had not been included in the estimates of the Budget, I did not appear before the committee. I was told it would be useless, regardless of the merits of the case, and that it would be a waste of the time of the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. And of the gentleman.

Mr. BURTNESS. The question raised by this amendment is simply whether or not it is advisable to purchase additional land for this school. This is a nonreservation school. The appropriations last year were authorized upon the basis of 200 pupils. The hearings show that there was an average enrollment of 222 pupils. There are several hundred applications in from pupils who can not be taken care of at the school. The school does not provide facilities for pupils in my district, because there happen to be no Indians in that district, although the school is in the corner of my district. It provides facilities for children that come from South Dakota, Minnesota, and a number from North Dakota.

Mr. MURPHY. How much ground is there at the school?

Mr. BURTNESS. The school now has approximately 150 acres of ground, or a little less, possibly, that can be used for cultivation purposes. It is in the valley of the Red River of the North, and there is no better land to be found anywhere. The superintendent of the school, not only the present one but a former one, has been anxious for a considerable time to get additional land. To show that additional land is required for the school, I need only point to the fact that they have during the past several years been renting some land, but even with that they have not sufficient to take care of the needs of the school. The school to-day has to buy hay and feed. Under the items proposed in the present bill they are increasing the appropriation so as to take care of 220 pupils, and upon the same basis of last year I presume the enrollment will actually be increased to 240 or 250.

The per capita cost of taking care of the school even in that cold climate is only \$188 each. If a reasonable amount of additional land can be provided, it is the contention of the people at the school that they can provide, among other things, plenty of wheat to take care of the flour needs of the pupils. To-day, as I have already suggested, they are trying to build up a herd of dairy cattle; they are trying to establish a herd there sufficient to meet the needs of the school, retaining the females and selling the males. There is no chance of keeping more females there without additional land for pasture as well as for raising forage for the winter.

As you all know, most of the pupils who come there naturally come from agricultural communities, and, in my judgment at least, it is fully as important, if not more important, to teach these Indian boys and girls something about farming out in that country, so that they can go back to their communities and know something about farming, as to acquire book learning.

If a reasonable-sized farm can be maintained in connection with the school it will be very beneficial for all concerned, both for the Government and for the pupils.

At Fort Totten, in the second district of my State, they have a large and substantial farm in connection with the Indian school there, and a great deal is accomplished in the way of enabling the students to develop along agricultural lines and be able to conduct their farming operations when they get back home. The land at the Wahpeton School at the present time can be bought—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTNESS. I might suggest that just now it is only reasonable to suppose that the additional land which is required could be bought very reasonably, due to the general agricultural depression. It would be a very good investment on the part of the Government to make the purchase now, rather than at a later date.

This present bill proposes an increase of 20 pupils, I believe, at the school. The fact is that in the immediate future there is expected to be a further increase. Some years ago there was appropriated \$20,000 for an additional school building and



\$10,000 for an assembly hall at the school, but owing to the war conditions the amount appropriated has not been sufficient, so that it has been deemed advisable not to let contracts up to this time for these buildings. I am informed by Mr. Meritt, Assistant Indian Commissioner, to-day that the bureau is now proceeding to advertise for bids for those contracts, and if contracts for such buildings are let, the school will be able to accommodate many more pupils. I hope the bids will be such that they can erect the required buildings within the appropriations available, and if that is done they expect to take care of nearly 300 pupils instead of 220.

This probable growth emphasizes that much more the need for additional land in the immediate future, so that this school would have in a general way somewhere nearly the same amount of land that like schools have up in that northwestern territory. This happens to be a place where perhaps the same objection can not be given against providing for the needs which we think are urgent as was made to the gentleman who presented the amendment for one of the California schools. The suggestion by the committee there was that the climate in California was so excellent that they might not need the additional appropriation to take care of the children. Our climate, while it is healthful and vigorous, and all that, is such that we do not always allow our children to sleep out of doors in the wintertime. We need this money not only to take care of some of these children who are clamoring to get into the school, but particularly to teach these young Indians something more about agriculture than they now know, and also to assist the Government in providing for the needs of the school, for the proceeds from the additional land, if bought, would amount to a splendid interest on the investment in the way of additional crops and produce. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the item that the gentleman asks, \$75,000, is a larger amount than is proposed for the extension of any other Indian school in the bill.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. The item suggested in the amendment is not \$75,000; it is \$32,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, \$32,000. Then I say that the amount that the gentleman suggests is still larger than any amount proposed for the extension of any other Indian school in the country, notwithstanding it has an attendance of only about 213, while there are others of 700 or 800, and with waiting lists.

Now, as to the particular needs of even that particular school, the committee feels that we must keep pretty well within the Budget and within the estimates that come from the bureaus, because they are carefully weighed and the relative consideration due to each institution is given to it.

The gentleman speaks of the importance of the land and the results obtained at Fort Totten School in the same State. There they have 1,560 acres and they are cultivating only 420 acres. I do not know how much they would cultivate of this proposed extension at Wahpeton if it were given to them.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Does the gentleman realize the difference in the value and quality of land near Wahpeton, N. Dak., and that at Fort Totten?

Mr. CRAMTON. No. They all look alike to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURTNESS. I am sure the gentleman does not, because if he had understood anything about it he would not have made the comparison.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman referred to Fort Totten as illustrating what could be done. I admit that the land near Wahpeton may be more desirable than that in the neighborhood of Fort Totten.

Mr. BURTNESS. Much of it there is brush and hills.

Mr. CRAMTON. About one-third is used. Now, as to the estimates of this particular school, I want to suggest that in the judgment of the management of that institution, and they are about as near to its needs as the estimates of anyone, if they are to have \$32,000, they have several places where they would like to put it before they want to buy any land. I read in the hearings a little while ago where a superintendent wanted \$200,000, where it was not approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

This superintendent sent in his estimates, the same as all the rest of them. He had the opportunity to ask for what he thought was needed. What did he ask for? He asked for support \$49,500, which is carried in the bill. He asked for repairs and improvements \$10,500, which the Budget and the committee reduced by \$1,500, allowing \$9,000. Then he asked for new buildings, assembly hall, \$45,000. There is nothing in the gentleman's amendment about that. He wanted for the pur-

chase of laundry, machine shop, kitchen and dining-room equipment, \$5,000. There is nothing in the gentleman's amendment about those things. On the other hand, there is not a word in the estimate of the superintendent as to any need of any more land.

In the absence of a more clear showing as to the needs, I hope we will not appropriate \$32,000 as requested, more than we are giving to any other Indian school in the country for extension.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Does the gentleman recall that the Senate regarded this as of sufficient importance to attach the item to an emergency deficiency bill a year ago?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not recall that, but I know that another body has attached to appropriation bills many things that are of very questionable value.

Mr. BURTNESS. I take it the gentleman does not contend that this additional land is not desired by the superintendent.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is no evidence except the gentleman's statement, which I accept.

Mr. BURTNESS. I have several letters here which I should be glad to have the gentleman read.

Mr. CRAMTON. I accept the gentleman's statement, but in the superintendent's own report it is not asked for.

Mr. BURTNESS. The \$45,000 asked for building is plainly a duplicate of the \$30,000 which is already available, which doubtless the superintendent did not understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURTNESS].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BURTNESS) there were—ayes 5, noes 9.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that in line 19, on page 50, there is a typographical error in the spelling of the word "Fort."

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask unanimous consent that that typographical error be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to return to page 50, line 19, to correct a typographical error in the spelling of the word "Fort." Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The sum of \$325,000 is hereby appropriated out of the principal funds to the credit of the Confederate Bands of Ute Indians, the sum of \$75,000 of said amount for the benefit of the Ute Mountain (formerly Navajo Springs) Band of said Indians in Colorado, and the sum of \$175,000 of said amount for the Uintah, White River, and Uncompahgre Bands of Ute Indians in Utah, and the sum of \$75,000 of said amount for the Southern Ute Indians in Colorado, which sums shall be charged to said bands, and the Secretary of the Interior is also authorized to withdraw from the Treasury the accrued interest to and including June 30, 1923, on the funds of the said Confederate Bands of Ute Indians appropriated under the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., p. 934), and to expend or distribute the same for the purpose of promoting civilization and self-support among the said Indians, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall report to Congress, on the first Monday in December, 1924, a detailed statement as to all moneys expended as provided for herein.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLTON: Page 63, line 8, after the word "herein," strike out the period and insert: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds in this paragraph shall be expended on road construction unless wherever practicable preference shall be given to Indians in the employment of labor on all roads constructed from the sums herein appropriated from the funds of the Confederate Bands of Utes."

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Gladly.

Mr. CRAMTON. The language of this amendment has been discussed with the subcommittee by the gentleman from Utah. The subcommittee see no objection to it and have no opposition to it. We had not supposed the language to be necessary, but had supposed that to be the policy, as it generally is the policy. The gentleman from Utah states that he has evidence that that policy has not been followed, and so he thinks the language is necessary, and the committee have no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, just a word in reply. Complaint has been made to me that on this reservation the Indians are not given the preference. In a letter which I have received from an Indian it is stated that—

But little of the road money is paid to the Indians. Yesterday I visited the road camp and found 26 teams with drivers and 9 single hands. Of this number only one team was owned by an Indian, and



he is not a member of the tribe; and among the single hands only one was an Indian. I know of many Indians who have applied for work and have been refused. We are willing and anxious to work, and we need the money. A number of our tribe are badly in need.

From the information contained in this letter I infer that preference is not given to the Indians. Hence I have offered this amendment. I do not know how accurate the information is, but the amendment is in harmony with numerous other provisions in the bill and can do no harm.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the construction of lateral distributing systems to irrigate the allotted lands of the Uncompahgre, Uintah, and White River Utes in Utah, and to maintain existing irrigation systems authorized under the act of June 21, 1906, \$100,000, to be paid from the principal funds held by the United States in trust for the Confederate Bands of Ute Indians.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There have been a great many complaints made to me that the expenses of maintaining this particular system are excessive. I have tried all day to get certain information but have not succeeded, and am asking now if the chairman of the subcommittee can give it. I notice in the hearings, as recorded on page 460, that among the items of expenditures of a similar amount last year is one of salaries and wages in the sum of \$57,742. In fact, over half of the money appropriated was paid out in salaries and wages, and the complaint to me is that this work is costing too much and that it can be done much more cheaply. It may be interesting to the committee to know that a great many white settlers irrigate lands adjoining the Indian lands and use jointly the same canals. In some of these canals the rights of the Indians have been entirely extinguished, yet the Government continues to operate and maintain these canals at the expense of the white settlers.

Those using the canals have no voice whatever in their maintenance or, at least, in the expenditure of the money. They pay what they consider large assessments and have no voice at all in the expenditure of the money thus paid.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he was trying to get information as to the rates of wages and salaries paid under this item?

Mr. COLTON. I am trying to get whatever information I can as to how this money is expended.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will state that the information before the committee is that there is a proposed salary roll of \$31,360, the same as for the current year. That carries an engineer at \$2,000, a junior engineer at from \$1,800 to \$2,040, an instrument man at from \$1,200 to \$1,500, a hydrographer at \$1,500, a chief clerk at from \$1,200 to \$1,380, a foreman at \$1,500, supervisors of ditches at \$1,600 to \$1,800 and ditch riders at \$1,380, there being one of each of those positions except the last, and there being 14 of the ditch riders.

In addition to that there is proposed \$40,000 in wages, which is miscellaneous and temporary labor at from \$3 to \$6 per day.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, in reply to what the gentleman has said, let me state that a committee of white settlers representing those who use these canals jointly with the Indians have made representations to me and to the department that this work can be done very much cheaper than it is now being done. They say that there is a large item of expense connected with the use and operation of automobiles which is unnecessary and that the work of maintaining the canals can be done much more economically. The white settlers are asking that they be given some voice in the expenditure of the money to operate the canal. It is hoped that some system can be worked out whereby they can have some voice in the operation. I simply arose to make this statement and to ask information of the committee, which the chairman has kindly supplied. I appreciate it.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and civilization of Qui-nai-elts and Quil-leh-utes, including pay of employees, \$900.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that we have appropriated here for the support of the Qui-nai-elts and the Quil-leh-utes, including the pay of employees in the State of Washington, the sum of \$900. I would like to make the observation that the Qui-nai-elts and Quil-leh-utes are not being very well supported and not becoming any too well civilized, with a few exceptions. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee what employee receives the \$900?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is one-half of the time of one clerk at a salary of \$1,200 a year, being \$600 for half his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am not surprised that the Qui-nai-elts and Quil-leh-utes are not getting along any better. They are dying off and a few have allotments, but a number of them never received an allotment and never will. It will be some time before the proceeds for sales of timber from that part of their forest which belongs to the tribe will be paid into a tribal fund. There seems now to be little or nothing in that fund, therefore some of these Indians must be supported by the Government in spite of their potential wealth. Old and dependent folks are thrown in on those who are still older to be fed, and they have to beg and borrow, in spite of resources of great value. They live on in the hope that some day they will come into possession of the fifteen or twenty million dollars, the value of the timber reservation.

The sale of timber on allotted lands has begun and will help the situation a great deal, and a happy lot might as well abandon the hope.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and civilization of Indians at Colville, Taholah, Puyallup, and Spokane Agencies, including pay of employees, and for purchase of agricultural implements and support and civilization of Joseph's Band of Nez Perce Indians in Washington, \$11,000.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Washington says that he is powerless to get any benefit for this tribe of Indians in his State. I want to put in the RECORD two episodes in regard to making a change in this system which might seem to enforce his hopeless attitude but which does not, for no question is ever settled until it is settled right.

The first statement is by the soldier who founded the Carlisle School and was its superintendent for 25 years, Gen. R. H. Pratt, a faithful friend of the Indian. In 1904 he made a speech before the Baptist Church of New York City, in which he said:

I believe that nothing better could have happened to the Indians than the complete destruction of the bureau which keeps them so carefully laid away in the dark of its numerous drawers, together with all its varied influences, which only serve to bolster and maintain tribal conditions.

The early death of the "Freedmen's Bureau" was an infinite blessing to the Negro himself and to the country as well. If you say the turning loose of this large number of ignorant and unprepared people would threaten the peace of our communities, I say that not a year within the last 30 but we have imported from foreign countries and turned loose in the United States a much greater number of no less unprepared and ignorant people. One thing is certain, this bureau will never lift its finger to end its own life, and we can rely on it that its emotions are most pleasurable when Congress adds to it increased responsibilities in the distribution of money, etc. It is a barnacle to be knocked off some time.

Better, far better for the Indians had there never been a bureau. Then self-preservation would have led the individual Indian to find his true place, and his real emancipation would have been speedily consummated.

He made that speech while superintendent of the Carlisle School. He was discharged from his position. He had committed lese majeste. He was a dangerous agitator in the eyes of the bureau. He made this statement later:

If my speech before the Baptist ministers was untrue in any particular it ought to be easy to indicate wherein and to hold me responsible. No part of it is contested except it is alleged I said, "Indian Bureau officials are barnacles." What I said was that "the Indian Bureau is a barnacle to be knocked off some time."

It takes far-fetched construction to convert this into personal affront. I now repeat, that after 37 years of experience in Indian affairs, 25 years of it directly under the bureau, the bureau is a barnacle, because it is an unnatural, unphilosophical attachment to the ship of state whose perpetuity depends solely upon its being able to prevent the one race in America always here from getting aboard and becoming a real part of the American crew and family. It therefore clogs progress, and that is what a barnacle does. \* \* \*

In 1917 Mr. W. H. Gibbs, inspector in the Indian Service, resigned his position and, in a signed article published in the State, at Columbia, S. C., on January 14, 1917, he made this statement:

From association and contact with the Indian I have become convinced that his treatment by the Government is one of continued error heaped upon initial mistake. Originally segregated upon reservations in order to insure the safety of the whites who were thinly settled in outlying territory, the continuation of such a policy after the full attainment of its purposes has operated to delay the development, the amalgamation, and the civilization of the Indians in the fulfillment of their manifest destiny. This proposition is proved by the undeniable fact that those Indians who have cut loose from the Government have progressed far ahead of those who are still in serfdom as its wards.

This serfdom is a greater reproach to this Nation than was the slavery of the Negro. The tenure of the title to his lands and the holding of his funds by the Government are sometimes used to coerce him into compliance with Government requirements, thus sapping independence and undermining his character. Therefore, if there is decadence in the manhood of the old Indians thus treated the Government owes support to those Indians it has ruined, and education to their children to keep them from being ruined also. Its activities should stop there.



Everywhere there are capable and competent Indians who ought to be free and independent citizens to-day, but usually the office keeps them chained to their stationary cotribal members.

The proud, sensitive, high-strung Indian often feels that hope for him and his lies not on this side of the grave.

The young and middle-aged adult Indians should be given their land and money and made citizens of America, and citizenship should be conferred on the minors as fast as they reach maturity.

If any squander their heritage it will be no more than our white citizens do, and usually the school of adversity alone confers a valuable civic education.

Turn such Indians loose now under some well-considered plan and they, humanity, and civilization will soon be the gainers.

The emancipated Cherokees of North Carolina and Onondas of Wisconsin have done more for themselves than the Government has done for any Indians still enslaved under its wardship.

My severance from the service is voluntary on my part, partly from a feeling of hopelessness in going after real progressive reform through the heavy machinery of the Indian Office. If field workers could talk for publication as I know they feel, in the main my points would be overwhelmingly sustained. As a rule they are faithful workers and distressingly underpaid.

The reason for my conclusions may be found in the facts and details in my official reports, which should be open to the public, which are susceptible of proof and have never been excepted to by office, though often of grave importance.

Entering the Indian Service in the belief that the Indian Office was designed and conducted as a benefaction to the race, I am leaving it convinced that it is the Indian's "Old Man of the Sea," who will try to cling around his neck in a strange hold forever.

Mr. Chairman, here are two men of wide experience in the Indian Service under different conditions, one the superintendent of the best school the Indian Bureau ever had, which was abolished because it was making real Americans out of these original Americans, and the other a man who endeavored to lift the Indians out of tribalism and degradation, and gave it up in the face of the opposition of the bureau system.

It does seem a hopeless task, when years after their valiant efforts in official position were made, we find the system as strongly entrenched as ever and all efforts to change it ridden down.

But I am not afraid of the final outcome. Whenever the American people come to know the facts of this most un-American system they will command and secure a new policy.

History teaches but one lesson, and that is that for injustice and oppression and subjection doomsday comes at last. Freedom is stronger than serfdom. I am firm in the faith that there will be sunrise for the American Indians, when out of the night of bureaucratic control and injustice and misery they shall step forth as Americans into the dawn of a new day of freedom and development as full-fledged members of the Republic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me say to the gentleman that that start is being made, because they have cut down the Qui-nai-elts from \$1,000 to \$900. The paragraph just read is for the support and civilization of the Indians at Colville, Taholah, Puyallup, and the Spokane agencies, and the amount is \$11,000. How is that amount divided up? I would like particularly to know the amount that goes to the Puyallup agency, and where that agency is at this time.

Mr. CRAMTON. I fully understand, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Washington is asking questions about matters that he understands much better than I do myself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no. Before the gentleman undertakes to answer—

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman understands that he understands better than the chairman does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then, if that is so, these Indians are surely in a bad way. I am serious about that. If I remember correctly, it is only two or three years ago that Congress abolished the Puyallup School. Out of the clear sky they abolished that school, regardless of the treaties with the Indians. When they abolished that school that left about a dozen tribes of Indians in the western part of Washington with no headquarters. Thereupon, after the department down here discovered that, they hitched one-half of these tribes to the agency in the district of my colleague [Mr. HADLEY] and the other half of them to the agency at Taholah, which is the county seat, you might say, of the Qui-nai-elts, and after doing that they discovered that it was too much to have these Indians come from clear up near the Cushman School down to this place on the ocean beach, so they moved the headquarters of the Qui-nai-elts and allied tribes away from there, and I do not know where they have moved the Puyallup agency and I am asking for that information.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman discussed this matter at one time with the chairman of the subcommittee, and the chairman of the subcommittee took him into a conference with the Assistant Indian Commissioner, and the gentleman came out of that conference with a smile on his face.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; and that is all I got.

Mr. CRAMTON. I supposed that he obtained all that he wanted to know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no.

Mr. CARTER. As I recall the information the gentleman speaks of, it is that these agencies have all been consolidated with the general agency at Nes Palem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And so when we say for the Indians at the Puyallup agency, we mean ex-agency?

Mr. CARTER. I think the Nes Palem is an agency for all of those tribes, although I would not be positive about that. That is my recollection when I was at Nes Palem several years ago. At that time it was being contemplated to remove a number of the agencies to Nes Palem and operate all of them from that place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think the gentleman must be mistaken in part.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] read a letter a moment ago comparing the Indian Bureau to a certain extent to the Freedman's Bureau, and in his speech yesterday morning he also made some comparison of that kind and spoke of the promise of 40 acres of land and a mule that was made by the Freedman's Bureau. The Freedman's Bureau was a thing which operated down in my country, and I do not think it is proper to begin to compare the Indian Bureau with that. I can give the gentleman an instance of that which will show, I think, that he is mistaken in making that comparison. One of these fellows appeared in my own county and claimed to be a representative of the Freedman's Bureau, having come there to set off the 40 acres and allot the mule. He went up to old Mr. Evans's plantation, who had been a large slave holder before the war. He had a splendid plantation. All of the slaves had left the place where they lived to show that they were free. The old colored foreman was there, however. This agent or representative of the Freedman's Bureau said to the old man: "I have come here to lay off your 40 acres of land, and you can get the mule out of old man Evans after you get the land." This man picked out a piece of land, the 40 acres, and it had a good cabin on it, and he moved in. The old man Evans went out and discovered him the next day, and said: "What are you doing here?" He replied that this was his land; that the man from the Freedman's Bureau had been down there and laid off his land. He had laid it off; had set a little peg with a red ball on top of it at each corner. Mr. Evans then asked him whether he got a paper for it, and he said yes, he did, that he got a deed. He went to the house and got his deed and brought it out. The fellow had charged him \$5, incidentally. I think I may have that deed yet in my office to-day, and the man had written on it the following:

Even as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness so have I lifted this nigger out of \$5.

That is about the way the Freedman's Bureau operated, and I hope the gentleman will not compare the Indian Bureau to that.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I had yesterday a copy of that same deed, and I shall be glad to put it into the RECORD word for word. There have been instances where the Indian Bureau has given a man 40 acres, and he has made it his home, raised hay there and used it for 17 years, when a tribal herd was allowed to run over it and utterly destroy it, and he did not have his 40 acres at all.

Mr. STEVENSON. All he could do was to raise Cain?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

For operation and maintenance, including repairs, of the Toppenish-Simcoe irrigation system, on the Yakima Reservation, Wash., reimbursable as provided by the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. L. p. 28), \$5,000.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 66, line 13, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Page 66, line 13, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$50,000."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. What is the effect of the amendment?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The effect will be to comply with this situation: At the Toppenish-Simcoe irrigation unit, on the Yakima Reservation, there was first authorized to be expended \$150,000. Later the authorization was increased to \$200,000. However, only \$150,000 has been expended. Expecting the faithful performance on the part of the Indian Bureau and the Congress, the local people there have cleared up the sagebrush and prepared the land for immediate irrigation and for cultivation. They have waited year after year for an expenditure of the additional \$50,000 which was authorized to be expended on that unit. They feel greatly disappointed and



aggrieved that their Government has not carried out the evident intent of Congress.

In fact one of those Indians was in my office just a few days ago and related this story: One of their Indians died and went up to the pearly gates seeking entrance to the happy hunting grounds and was there asked by St. Peter for his record. The Indian replied, "The Indian Bureau has my record." St. Peter turned to an assistant and said, "Step inside and find some one from the Indian Bureau and bring this Indian's record." The assistant was gone for three hours and returned, saying, "Nobody from the Indian Bureau here." [Laughter.]

That is the feeling of the Indians in that particular section. They do not believe they are receiving fair and just treatment from the bureau.

Mr. RAKER. Which section did he come from?

A MEMBER. California.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Washington. [Laughter.]

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. We believe that in good faith we ought to do for the Indians of that part of the reservation what we do for Indians on either side, on the Wapato side and the Satus side, which lands lie adjacent to the lands contemplated to be irrigated by this amendment. This is not a new project.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows that the inclusion of one of the new extension items carried in this bill, the one item that has perhaps more to do than any other item in the bill in raising the irrigation costs above the current year, was the inclusion of the item at the gentleman's initiative, I assume, for the Satus unit. Has the gentleman any idea that while other projects all over the country are being neglected and requests are being denied, the Government is going to open up the Treasury doors wide to the people of his district?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Not at all, I will say to the chairman of the subcommittee. But this \$50,000 was authorized some three years ago, and it was fully expected that it would be provided in order that a certain amount of work might be done at this time, and it is in order to take care of that situation that I have offered this amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman think that the need for that \$50,000 is greater than the need for the \$150,000 for the Satus unit? If the gentleman feels that way, I think the matter may be corrected.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I am informed the land at the one place can be irrigated for less, perhaps, than that at the other. However, each unit stands on its own merits, and I am contending for fair and equal treatment for all parts of the Yakima Indian Reservation. Our obligation under the treaty of 1855 is the same to all of these Indians. Our present plan makes some of them wealthy while others eke out a bare existence. During the past four years I have repeatedly presented the merits of the Wapato, the Toppenish-Simcoo, and the Satus units and have introduced bills and offered amendments seeking funds with which to carry forward the work on these various units.

I am gratified that at last we are securing \$125,000 for the Satus unit; at the same time I earnestly urge favorable action on my amendment for \$50,000 for the Toppenish-Simcoo unit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask the Chairman how long he intends to keep us here?

Mr. CRAMTON. We expect to run until 5.30. That will pass us through, as I understand, matters that are not controverted respecting the Pension Office and the Patent Office.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman ought to turn us loose now.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think our speeches are all made now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For completion of the road on the Quinault Reservation, Wash., \$7,500, reimbursable from the tribal funds of said Indians as provided in the act of May 25, 1918. (40 Stat. L. p. 588.)

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WATSON. I notice two or three items in this bill of appropriations for road construction. Are these roads permanently constructed for automobile purposes? Or are they open trails, or are they simply dirt roads? I find the appropriations are very small.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think they are permanent roads. The character of the road, I suppose, varies with the circumstances.

Mr. WATSON. Seven thousand five hundred dollars would not go very far in building permanent roads in Pennsylvania. They cost us about \$90,000 a mile.

Mr. CRAMTON. They are not of that kind.

Mr. WATSON. I presume these are trails.

Mr. CRAMTON. They are more than trails. They may be dirt roads or gravel roads in some cases.

Mr. WATSON. I was wondering whether it was the intention of the Government to build permanent roads through the reservations.

Mr. CRAMTON. In some cases they are paved roads and in other cases they are dirt roads.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of constructing an irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, including the Big Wind River and Dry Creek Canals, and including the maintenance and operation of completed canals, \$200,000, reimbursable as provided by existing law.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RHODES. I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Michigan a question. I see that \$200,000, reimbursable, is provided for in line 17 on page 69. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if any part of the \$200,000 is to be expended for doing new construction work on this irrigation project or is it all to be expended for maintenance and operation?

I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that in 1919 the Committee on Indian Affairs made a very thorough investigation into this whole matter of reimbursable legislation for irrigation purposes, and as a result of this investigation it was ascertained that much of the work on the various irrigation projects of the Northwest has been carried far beyond the point of necessity; that is to say, on many of these projects there are thousands and tens of thousands of acres of land under irrigation where there is nobody, neither Indian nor white man, to make beneficial use of the water. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that there should be no further sums expended on new projects until use is made of all available water, and that the only justification for the expenditure of any of the Indians' money or for the expenditure of any of the Government's money on these projects is for maintenance and for the operation of the units that are completed.

Mr. CRAMTON. Replying to the gentleman's question, I now have the information at hand, and it is stated that the funds available for work on the Wind River project for the past two years have been so limited that very little has been done in the way of betterment and construction work, with the result that a large amount of work of that class must be done at the earliest practicable date or considerable portions of several of the units will be unfit for further service. Several of the units contain laterals having from 5 to 15 drops constructed of timber of from 4 to 9 feet, many of which have been in use since 1906 and 1907 and are now so badly decayed that it is practically impossible to make repairs that are effective. For the past four years considerable portions of available funds have been required to make temporary repairs to these hundreds of old structures, and it is a serious economic waste to continue to spend money on temporary repairs to structures in such condition. As a matter of fact, unless many of these structures are immediately replaced there is grave danger of the system's failing at a critical time, which will result in great damage to crops.

In addition to this, each year some new tracts are being broken and put into cultivation, which require the construction of new laterals and structures to enable delivery of water to the tracts. The needed demands for irrigation purposes, especially during years of insufficient precipitation, necessitate



better diversion facilities and in some cases storage. The construction of the Ray Lake storage reservoir is now considered urgent. This reservoir will store water from the Little Wind River during flood season, which will greatly facilitate the delivery of water during low-water season, as the low-water flow of this river has always been found inadequate to supply the lands now under cultivation. When the Ray Lake storage reservoir is available for use it will also greatly relieve the low-water diversion requirements of the Ray and Coolidge ditches and permit a large quantity of water to flow to the subagency unit and to numerous private Indian ditches on the Little Wind River. The cost of operating and maintaining the system must also be taken care of, and in addition thereto it is necessary to make irrigable area surveys at the earliest practicable date, so as to be in position to make proper proof of beneficial use of water. So there is some construction proposed, but apparently it is only that which is necessary to protect the investment already made.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask this further question: Has the committee considered the question of fixing a permanent policy in carrying forward these irrigation projects in making up the estimates for these reimbursable appropriations?

Mr. CRAMTON. I assume that the general policy will be a continuance of the reimbursable feature, so that at any rate when the lands come into white ownership they will be subject to the repayment of these costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RHODES. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES: Page 69, line 17, strike out "\$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000."

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. RHODES. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman stated a little while ago that as a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs he had given considerable time and attention to the question of the reimbursable feature of these funds expended for reclamation. Did the gentleman or his committee make a report on that subject?

Mr. RHODES. The committee held hearings and reached a conclusion that Congress should not make further appropriations for new construction work on these irrigation projects until beneficial use had been made of all the water provided for, and I do not believe you will find in the appropriation acts of 1920 and 1921 there is authorization for new construction work on these projects.

Mr. RAKER. It seems to me that there is nothing more beneficial to the Indians than the development of these irrigation projects. And the reason I am so particular in asking these questions is that the Government will be protected and will be able to have refunded to it the money expended on these projects. I think we ought to be fair with ourselves in considering these matters.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman raises a technical legal question. Of course, my opinion should not be controlling either as to the position of this committee or as to what conclusion the gentlemen may arrive at, but I do say that in these cases large sums of money have been expended on irrigation projects for which there seems to be little justification; and with due regard to those who have brought about these projects, I am prepared to say that the testimony before our subcommittee was that in most cases they were the white man's projects. The Indian was not consulted in the first instance, and he was not consulted as to the expenditure of money in the development of these projects, and in many cases he has found his property encumbered for more money than it is worth for construction charges. In truth and in fact the policy of ambitious white men and the policy of the Interior Department has been to try to convert large areas of land into farming lands which by nature are unfitted for that purpose. The severe climate, the short season, the lack of rainfall, and everything that make successful agriculture possible are wanting. Congress authorized a committee to go into the Indian reservations, and that committee went over the reservations and found that in the opinion of both Indians and many white men large sums of money had been expended on projects which were not justified, and for that reason this committee decided that no further money should be appropriated for new work until all the land now under water has been used.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RHODES. I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. What the gentleman is saying is very interesting, but it does not apply to the particular case that he is discussing. If he will give me an opportunity to enlighten him as to that particular case I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to complete my statement. Then the gentleman will be able to make his statement and I shall be very delighted to hear it. Like a great many of our distinguished friends from the extreme Northwest the gentleman from Wyoming is very zealous in the cause of irrigation. What I was about to say was that as a result of a well-directed effort a well-meaning committee was sent by the Congress into the Northwest and made an investigation, and it was the opinion of that committee that Congress is not justified in appropriating these large sums of money against the Indians' will on these new projects. This sum of \$200,000, appearing on page 69, in line 17, seems to be a large sum of money for a small project. I was only wanting to know if it is the policy of the present committee to change the plan that was adopted by your committee in the Sixty-sixth Congress, which I thought was well understood and accepted by Congress?

My question to the chairman of the committee is this: What is the policy of the present committee? Now, if \$100,000 is not a reasonable sum for carrying forward the improvements that are necessary, then, of course, I shall not be grieved if this committee votes down my amendment. But I do think in a majority of these cases it is largely problematical as to what the result will be, and not justified.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman could hardly expect to cut out of this bill any portion of this particular \$200,000, could he?

Mr. RHODES. I offer the amendment in good faith.

Mr. RAKER. Why does the gentleman ask that question?

Mr. BLANTON. I think it would take great effort to do it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I asked the gentleman from Missouri to yield to me, and he refused.

Mr. RHODES. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman need not do that, but I would like to hear some word about this particular item. Does the gentleman know that this particular item is extravagant? So far I submit that there has been no discussion of this item.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think that my services here or my action in regard to appropriations justify anyone in suggesting that the appropriations that relate to my section or my State do not have the same scrutiny that other appropriations do. The increase in the item referred to is not only justified but the item could have been increased still more and still be justified.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RHODES] clearly has in mind, in the statement he made, certain projects in the Northwest for the irrigation of lands partly held by Indians but proposed to be reclaimed largely for the benefit of white men. Some of these projects have merit and some have not much merit. We discussed one yesterday which I do not think has much merit, but it carried a small appropriation in this bill. But this is an Indian irrigation project. It is on an Indian reservation. The lands are all owned by Indians except where the land of a deceased Indian has been sold to a white man, the white man paying the full value, including construction cost, under regulations carefully prepared by the department. In that way there are white settlers scattered throughout the reservation, occupying perhaps 20 or 25 per cent of the irrigable land. There is no fairer area of irrigable land anywhere of the same latitude and altitude than this area.

It is a good fruit country; it is a part of my State where we grow the best apples. It is a wonderful alfalfa section. It is a good grain section. It is an ideal farming country, largely owned by the Indians, operated by the Indians, farmed by the Indians—one of the projects in the United States where the Indian is really making splendid progress in the cultivation of the land.

I went through the reservation this last summer and fall several times, over different roads, and I saw fine hay and straw stacks, and threshing machines at work, and I took pains to inquire whether the farms and the stacks and the machines were those of white men or Indians. I found that in a majority of cases the stacks of wheat and alfalfa and the machines were those of Indians, operated for and by the Indians.



During the war the development of this project, which has been going on for a number of years for the benefit of the Indians with their complete approval under treaty provisions to that effect, the appropriation was reduced to \$75,000 a year. With that sum it has not been possible to keep the ditches already built in a good state of preservation and it has been utterly impossible to extend the system or even the laterals to the additional lands which the Indians themselves were desirous of cultivating.

The Indians not only made the treaty under which we are doing this work, they are not only taking advantage of the work being done and farming their land, but these Indians have abundant sources from which the money will be repaid. They own over a million acres of land on the north side of the Big Wind River which they have ceded to the United States but which has not yet been sold. A large portion of it is under lease for grazing purposes, bringing a steady revenue for the benefit of the Indians. On that land there are several oil fields.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. These oil wells are a long way from the railroad. They are just beginning to get in operation, but from these oil fields alone these Indians will be able to repay not only all the costs of reclamation but have a fine sum remaining. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that the criticism aimed by him at certain enterprises on so-called Indian lands for the benefit of white men have a reasonable basis, but what he has said in no way applies to this particular Indian project, where the land is rich, where the climate is good, where the project is being carried on economically, and where the Indians are utilizing it, and where they have abundant resources for payment.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman has stated a number of conditions which are certainly ideal, and I think I am justified in pressing this further question. If it is answered to my satisfaction, of course I shall not be disappointed if my amendment fails. The gentleman has indicated that it is necessary from the Indian standpoint, and that is the thing about which I am particularly concerned. Does the gentleman say that the Indians are requesting the appropriation of \$200,000 for the continuation of this project?

Mr. MONDELL. I visited this project recently. I found everyone interested anxious for a larger appropriation, particularly the Indian farmers. My attention was called to the fact that the money which has been appropriated during the past four years—the war period—was wholly insufficient for the maintenance of the system in good condition and for the necessary extension of the canals and laterals to the land. I discovered on inquiry that there had been a request submitted for an increase in the appropriation. This is an Indian project, and a good one.

Mr. RHODES. It is very refreshing to know that there is at least one Indian project.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of constructing roads and bridges upon the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, \$20,000, said sum to be reimbursed from any funds which are now or may hereafter be placed in the Treasury to the credit of said Indians, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said Indians until paid.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, before that motion is put I have an amendment I desire to offer, and so has my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. McCINTIC].

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman will have any rights to-morrow that he has now.

Mr. CARTER. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma has an amendment which could be disposed of at once.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will there be any debate upon it?

Mr. McCINTIC. No.

Mr. CRAMTON. If there is no debate, I will withhold my motion.

Mr. CARTER. Then I ask unanimous consent that we return to page 21, line 12.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, I prefer to have a little consideration of that. The gentleman will have his opportunity to-morrow. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13559 and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### RUSSIAN RELIEF.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report by the Surgeon General of the Army showing the medicines, medical, surgical, and hospital supplies transferred to American relief organizations under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President to transfer certain medical supplies for the relief of the distressed and famine-stricken people of Russia," approved January 20, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 23, 1922.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCFADDEN, for 10 days, on account of important business.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 29, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13359) granting a pension to Mary Burdick, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 13593) making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 13594) to amend section 14 of the military services act approved June 10, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 13595) authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of a drawbridge across the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal in Williamsport, Washington County, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 13596) providing for the erection of a post-office and public building at Belding, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COLTON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the President to appoint a "silver commission" to endeavor to bring about a larger use of silver and stabilize its value; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 475) requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives certain facts in his possession concerning the United States Sugar Equalization Board; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 13597) granting a pension to James A. Franklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13598) to provide an examination and survey of the Columbia River at Kalama, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 13599) granting a pension to Midian Mercer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13600) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Shinall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13601) providing for the retirement of Richard F. Pellett; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 13602) granting a pension to Margaret Devlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6690. By Mr. CRAMTON: Memorial of the Minerva Club, of Croswell, Mich., protesting against the "all-year park measure" and the water-power amendment to the Barbour bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6691. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of San Francisco Post, Society of American Military Engineers, urging adequate military preparedness in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6692. By Mr. LAYTON: Petition of sundry citizens of Wilmington, Del., favoring the abolishment of the tax on small-

arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6693. By Mr. PARKS of Arkansas: Petition of sundry citizens, favoring the abolishment of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6694. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of Valley Forge Chapter, No. 330, Order of Eastern Star, and citizens of Pennsylvania asking for the passage of the Towner-Sterling bill for the creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

6695. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Kiwanis Club of Fargo, N. Dak., upon the subject of location, etc., of Government building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.